

Dr. Klebs

2-79

with the author's
complements

SOME LOST WORKS
OF
COTTON MATHER

[uncollected]

BY
GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE

YALE
MEDICAL LIBRARY



HISTORICAL
LIBRARY

COLLECTION OF

Arnold R. Kleb

SOME LOST WORKS
OF
COTTON MATHER

BY
GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE

REPRINTED FROM THE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY
VOLUME XLV

CAMBRIDGE
JOHN WILSON AND SON
University Press
1912



Cottonus Matherus
S. Theologiae Doctor. Regiae Societatis Londinensis. Socius.
et Ecclesiae apud Berolinam. Natus Amstelredam. nuper Praeceptor.
Aetatis Suae LXV, MDCXXXVII. Pictum ad vivum pinxit ab Orgon. Peck et sculpsit.

SOME LOST WORKS OF COTTON MATHER

SOME LOST WORKS OF COTTON MATHER.

To attempt the recovery of several lost or strayed works of Cotton Mather looks like a waste of energy. For the catalogue of Mather's writings is already of so prodigious a length that the student of American literature may well revolt at the thought of reading any further "composures" from his tireless pen. However, it is not a new batch of funeral sermons that will occupy us, but a series of tracts and letters on variolous inoculation; and this is a subject of uncommon significance, both in New England history and in the annals of medical science. No apologies, therefore, will be demanded of the searcher for derelect material, provided his quest results in something tangible.¹

¹ In preparing this paper I have been able to use an admirable essay by Dr. Reginald H. Fitz, *Zabdiel Boylston, Inoculator, and the Epidemic of Smallpox in Boston in 1721* (*The Johns Hopkins University Bulletin*, xxii, 315-327). Mr. Tuttle has been of material assistance again and again. I am indebted to Mr. Herbert Putnam, Librarian of Congress, for indispensable facsimiles and for copies of manuscripts. Mr. Frederick L. Gay has had the great kindness to lend me a transcript of all of Cotton Mather's letters that are preserved in the Letter-Book of the Royal Society, and to allow me to make such extracts as I might need. This transcript is cited as the "Gay ms."

Two unpublished lists of Mather's *Curiosa Americana* (communications to the Royal Society), drawn up in his own handwriting, are several times cited in the course of this study. (1) The first, which I call "the Catalogue of 1723," was enclosed in a letter to Dr. James Jurin, Secretary of the Society, May 21, 1723. It was intended to be exhaustive, up to that date, except for the *Curiosa* of 1712, which Mather omitted because excerpts from them had been printed in the *Philosophical Transactions*, xxix, 62-71. I have used a transcript of this Catalogue in the Gay ms., fols. 179-181. (2) The second (cited as "the Loose Leaf List") is on a single leaf in the possession of the American Antiquarian Society. It is obviously the table of contents of a sheaf of draughts which have disappeared. It contains thirteen titles, which correspond (if we disregard a few slight variations in phraseology) to the last thirteen in the Catalogue of 1723, and occur in the same order, — but there is one striking exception: the second title in the Loose Leaf List is "*Variolæ triumphatæ*: or, The Small-Pox Inoculated," which is given as a letter to Dr. Woodward. In place of this we have, in the Catalogue of 1723, "An Account of the Method & Success of Inoculating the Small-Pox. To

I. CURIOSITIES OF THE SMALL-POX (1716); ADDRESS TO THE PHYSICIANS (1721); THE BOYLSTON TRACT (1721).

At the outset, a repetition of familiar things is necessary, in order to ensure clearness in the sequel. In particular, we must call to mind the main facts about two famous letters (the first by Timonius, the second by Pylarinus), since, though quite distinct and published at different times, they are often cited together, almost as if they were parts of one and the same document.

In December, 1713, Emanuel Timonius (Timoni), a Doctor of Medicine of both Padua and Oxford,¹ and a Fellow of the Royal Society, wrote a Latin letter from Constantinople, describing inoculation for the smallpox as practised in that city. Undoubtedly the epistle was addressed to Dr. John Woodward, Professor of Physic at Gresham College,² a leading member of the Royal Society and a correspondent of Cotton Mather. At all events, it was Woodward who communicated it to the Society, giving an English abstract of that portion which dealt with the novel practice, and subjoining the ætiological part in the original Latin. In this shape the letter of Timonius was printed in 1714, in No. 339 of the *Philosophical Transactions*,³ — the same number that contained excerpts from Cotton Mather's *Curiosa Americana* of 1712. In 1716 there appeared, in No. 347 of the same *Transactions*, another account of Constantinopolitan inoculation, entirely in Latin, from the pen of Jacobus Pylarinus (Pylarini), M.D., late Venetian consul in Smyrna.⁴ In 1717 Nos. 338–350 of the *Philosophical Transactions* were assembled and published as Vol. XXIX. This volume

M^r Dummer." On this variation see p. 455, note 1, *infra*. There is no date attached to the Loose Leaf List, but it certainly includes only *Curiosa* sent in 1721 and 1722 (all but one, probably, in the former year).

¹ "Timoni, Emanuel, D. Med. of Padua; incorporated 6 July, 1703" (Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, IV. 1488).

² In *Tractatus Bini de Nova Variolas per Transplantationem excitandi Methodo* (Leyden, 1721), the excerpts from Timonius are styled "compendium epistolæ a Dn. E. Timoni ad J. Woodward mense Xbri. an. 1713 . . . conscriptæ."

³ For April–June, 1714. The year is mentioned in the colophon of No. 339: "London, Printed . . . 1714."

⁴ Pylarinus's account was in a letter to Sir Hans Sloane, as appears from Sloane's paper in the *Transactions*, XLIX. 516. On Timonius and Pylarinus see also XLIX. 104–105.

of course included both the report of Timonius¹ and that of Pylarinus.²

It is the current opinion that these two articles came into the hands of Cotton Mather at the same moment, in or about 1721, as a loan from Dr. William Douglass, and that they suggested to him the idea of combating by inoculation the epidemic of smallpox which devastated Boston and vicinity in that year.³ This view, however, needs correction in certain important respects.

On Monday, July 2, 1716, Mather began the composition of a third series of *Curiosa Americana* for the Royal Society.⁴ He wrote one letter, addressed to Dr. John Woodward, on every weekday until, on Friday the 13th, he had completed the set, — eleven in all, forming a "Decad" and a supplementary epistle. These he entrusted, in the same month, to Samuel Woodward, Secretary of the Province, for delivery to the Doctor, along with a covering letter, which introduced the bearer. Secretary Woodward sailed for London in August,⁵ and undoubtedly fulfilled the trust. Mather's own draughts of the eleven *Curiosa* and the covering letter are in the possession of the Massachusetts Historical Society. None of the draughts is dated, but that of the covering letter is endorsed, in Mather's hand, "Letters to D^r Woodward. Sent by M^r Secretary Woodward. July — 1716." The fair copies which went to England are not known to be extant. Fortunately, however, a contemporary transcript of the series is preserved among the

¹ XXIX. 72-82.

² XXIX. 393-399.

³ See, for example, Fitz, 317; Bullock, *Life and Writings of William Douglass* (*American Economic Association, Economic Studies*, October, 1897, II. 268).

⁴ The first series of *Curiosa* was written November 17-29, 1712, and is excerpted in the *Philosophical Transactions*, No. 339, for April-June, 1714 (XXIX. 62-71). The originals are in the Letter-Book of the Royal Society, M. 2. 21-33. The second series was sent to England in 1714. We learn from the covering letter of July, 1716, that it consisted (apparently) of a "Decad" of letters. From this same covering letter we also discover that Mather feared the *Curiosa* of 1714 had never reached Dr. Woodward, and that he therefore enclosed copies (along with the *Curiosa* of July, 1716) in the packet entrusted to the Provincial Secretary. Thus it happens that, in the M. H. S. draughts, the *Curiosa* of 1714 are more or less mixed up with those of July, 1716 (see p. 421, note 1, *infra*).

⁵ Secretary Woodward sailed for England sometime between August 3 and September 5, 1716, as Mr. Albert Matthews informs me. The limits are fixed by a comparison between *Council Records*, VI. 494-495, and *Court Records*, x. 91 (in the Archives of the Commonwealth).

Sloane mss. in the British Museum, and from this we can recover the exact dates of eight out of the eleven *Curiosa*, — Nos. 1-5 and 9-11.¹ The tenth number interests us particu-

¹ The transcript is in Sloane ms. 3340 (fols. 277-297). It is headed "*Curiosa Americana continued in Letters to y^e Learned & Famous John Woodward M.D. F.R.S. M. Profess. from Cotton Mather. In y^e year 1716.*" Being made from the fair copies which Mather sent to Dr. Woodward, it of course preserves the dates of the several letters. The first of the series is labelled "N^o 1" and is dated "Boston N. England July 2. 1716." The others are not numbered, but they are arranged in chronological order. Thus on fols. 277-290a we have the first four, dated respectively (at the end of each) July 2, 3, 4 and 5, 1716. The fifth letter is curtailed by a lacuna between fols. 292 and 293 of the manuscript. What remains of it stands on fols. 290b-292, but the conclusion is lost, and with it the date, which, however, must have been July 6. After the lacuna comes the letter of July 11, 1716 (on fol. 293a); the latter part alone is preserved, but this carries the date. Then come (on fols. 293b-297) two letters dated respectively July 12 and 13, 1716. That of July 13th is shown, by a passage which it contains, to have been the eleventh and last ("Unto y^e Decad of Letters wherewith I have now address'd you, I shall add this as a sort of a *Postscript*"). We are able, therefore, to infer with certainty that the letters of July 11 and 12 stood ninth and tenth in the series, and that those lost in the lacuna were Nos. 6, 7 and 8 (July 7, 9 and 10). July 8 was Sunday, and a *dies non*.

It appears that Mather followed the same procedure in composing this series of *Curiosa* that we know he adopted in composing the Series of 1712. In that year his *Curiosa* (preserved in the originals, all dated, in the Letter-Book of the Royal Society, M. 2. 21-33, and accessible to me in the Gay ms., fols. 1-150) were begun on Monday, November 17, and were continued, at the rate of one a day, until the series was completed on the last day of the fortnight (Saturday, the 29th). On the 23d (Sunday) no letter was written, but Mather made up for the omission by writing two on Monday, the 24th. Thus the series of 1712 consisted of *thirteen* numbers. That of July, 1716, as we have seen, contained but *eleven*. The reasons are, (1) that, in 1716, Mather did not make up for Sunday by doubling his Monday's task, and (2) that he wrote no letter on the last day of the fortnight, since Saturday, July 14, 1716, was (as we learn from his *Diary*, II. 360) "sett apart for Supplications."

If it were not for the Sloane transcript, we should not be able to decide upon the precise dates and the order of the *Curiosa* of July, 1716, since the M. H. S. draughts are not only undated, but are disarranged. For the convenience of future editors of Mather papers, I append a list of these *Curiosa*, giving the title of each as it stands (in Mather's hand) in the draught, and the date of each as it stands in the Sloane transcript (which does not give the titles):

(1) *Monstrous Imprægnations*, July 2; (2) *A Monstrous Calf*, July 3; (3) *The Nidification of Pigeons*, July 4; (4) *A Trilon*, July 5; (5) *A Serpent securely handled*, [July 6], conclusion with date lost in Sloane lacuna; (6) lost in lacuna [July 7]; (7) lost in lacuna [July 9]; (8) lost in lacuna [July 10]; (9) *Surprizing Influences of the Moon*, July 11; (10) *Curiosities of the Small Pox*, July 12; (11) *The Fagiana*, July 13.

The letters missing in the Sloane transcript (Nos. 6, 7 and 8) are doubtless *A Strange Mischief to the Eyes*, *Strength of Imagination*, and *The Stone Mistaken*, but we cannot be sure of their order. All the titles of the 1714 and 1716 sets are included in the Catalogue of 1723, but that list does not enable us to date them or to sort them out with security.

larly. It was written on July 12, 1716, and is entitled *Curiosities of the Small-Pox* in the original draught and in the Catalogue of 1723. It has never been printed.

In this letter of July 12, 1716, after speaking of the previous history of the smallpox in New England and commenting on the epidemic of measles in 1713, Mather proceeds as follows:

All that I shall now add, will be my Thanks to you, for communicating to the Public in D^r *Halley's* Transactions, y^e Account which you had from D^r *Timonius*, at *Constantinople*, y^e Method of obtaining and procuring y^e *Small-Pox*, by *Insition*; which I perceive also by some in my Neighbourhood lately come from thence, has been for some time successfully practised there. I am willing to confirm you, in a favourable Opinion, of D^r *Timonius's* Communication; And therefore, I do assure you, that many months before I mett with any Intimations of treating y^e *Small-Pox*, with y^e Method of Inoculation, any where in *Europe*; I had from a Servant of my own, an Account of its being practised in *Africa*. Enquiring of my Negro-man *Onesimus*, who is a pretty Intelligent Fellow, Whether he ever had y^e *Small-Pox*; he answered, both, *Yes*, and, *No*; and then told me, that he had undergone an Operation, which had given him something of y^e *Small-Pox*, & would forever præserve him from it; adding, That it was often used among y^e *Guramantese*, & whoever had y^e Courage to use it, was forever free from y^e fear of the Contagion. He described y^e Operation to me, and shew'd me in his Arm y^e Scar, which it had left upon him; and his Description of it, made it the same, that afterwards I found related unto you by your *Timonius*.

This cannot but expire, in a Wonder, and in a request, unto my D^r *Woodward*. How does it come to pass, that no more is done to bring this operation, into experiment & into Fashion — in *England*? When there are so many Thousands of People, that would give many Thousands of Pounds, to have y^e Danger and Horror of this frightful Disease well over with y^m. I beseech you, syr, to move it, and save more Lives than D^r *Sydenham*. For my own part, if I should live to see y^e *Small-Pox* again enter into o^r City, I would immediately procure a Consult of o^r Physicians, to Introduce a Practice, which may be of so very happy a Tendency. But could we hear, that you have done it before us, how much would That embolden us!¹

¹ The extract follows the original draught, in Mather's hand (M. H. S.) in preference to the Sloane transcript. The variations are trifling.

Mather's slave Onesimus was presented to him by some generous parishioners on December 13th, 1707.¹ How promptly his new master asked him the inevitable question, "Have you had the smallpox?" we cannot tell. Two facts, however, are now clear: (1) Mather had heard of inoculation, from Onesimus, "many months"² before he saw Woodward's abstract of Timonius in the *Philosophical Transactions*; and (2) the abstract reached him at least five years before the epidemic of 1721 broke out. It is also manifest that the essay of Pylarinus had not come to hand when Mather wrote the letter of July 12, 1716.³

Now there is abundance of testimony that Dr. William Douglass⁴ did, at some time or other, lend Mather No. 339 of the *Philosophical Transactions* (containing Timonius) and No. 347 (containing Pylarinus), and that (soon after June 6, 1721) he reclaimed them and kept them close. The evidence comes not only from Douglass himself,⁵ but from Mather's devoted friends,⁶ so that there can be no doubt that it is trustworthy.

¹ *Diary*, I. 579.

² Compare *The Angel of Bethesda*, as quoted on p. 431, *infra*.

³ This is not surprising. No. 347 of the *Philosophical Transactions* (containing Pylarinus) was the issue "for the Months of Jan. Febr. and March 1716." It was certainly not published before April, and may have been several months late. No. 349 (for July-September, 1716) was not printed (as we learn from the colophon, p. 504) until 1717.

⁴ A valuable (though sometimes inaccurate) *Brief Memoir of William Douglass*, by Dr. T. L. Jennison, was printed in 1831 in *Medical Communications of the Massachusetts Medical Society*, v. 195-240. This is utilized by Professor Charles J. Bullock in his *Life and Writings of William Douglass (American Economic Association, Economic Studies, 1897, II. 265-290)*, which furnishes much additional information, but needs to be corrected in some details, particularly in the bibliography (p. 290). For other notices of Douglass, see Bullock, 265, note 1.

⁵ In an unpublished letter to Alexander Stuart, M.D., September 25, 1721, Douglass says that "some time ago" he lent "these Transactions" (Nos. 339 and 347) "to a certain credulous vain Preacher of this place called Mather" (*Royal Society Letter-Book*, D. 2, f. 2; Gay MS., fol. 260). He repeats the statement in a letter to Cadwallader Colden, May 1, 1722 (4 *Collections*, II. 169): "Having, sometime before the small-pox arrived, lent to a credulous preacher Mather, Jr., the *Philosophical Transactions* Nos. 339 and 377" [i. e. 347], etc. See also the following places in Douglass's published works: *Inoculation of the Small Pox as practised in Boston* (Boston, 1722), 1-2, 3-4; *Postscript to Abuses, &c. Obviated* [Boston, 1722], 2-3, 4-5; *A Dissertation concerning Inoculation of the Small-Pox* (Boston, 1730), 2; *Summary*, II. 409 (Boston, 1751); and a communication, obviously by Douglass, signed "W. Philanthropos," in the *Boston News-Letter*, No. 912 (for July 17-24, 1721). Cf. William Wagstaffe, *A Letter to Dr. Freind* (London, 1722) [Appendix], 1; *Boston News-Letter*, No. 945 (for March 5-12, 1722).

⁶ Zabdiel Boylston, introductory note to *Some Account*, etc. (Boston, 1721);

Douglass, according to Dr. Green, "took up his abode" in Boston in 1718.¹ Yet here is Mather, in 1716, well acquainted with the letter of Timonius (in No. 339), though not with that of Pylarinus (in No. 347). How are we to reconcile the clashing dates?

The key to the apparent contradiction may be found in the fact that *Douglass settled in Boston twice*, first temporarily, and afterwards for good. His dual venture is mentioned in Isaac Greenwood's anonymous *Dialogue between Academicus; and Sawny & Mundungus* (1722). Sawny (Douglass) says to Academicus (Greenwood): "Dr. MATHER, and Parson COLMAN too, have recommended me to the Esteem of the People."² And Academicus retorts:

Yes, *Sawny*, you came recommended to *them*, and they were so Credulous (as you call them) to hope well, and speak well of you. But you were so well known, they could procure you little practise, and accordingly you took a Voyage, but soon returned; where at last by their means you got a *little Credit*. However, but little notice was taken of you, till your *Opposition to Inoculation*, made you famous.³

To confirm Greenwood's story we have, (1) the opening sentence of an unpublished letter from Douglass to Dr. Alexander Stuart, September 25, 1721 ("I did my self the honour to writte to you twice or thrice since my last arrival in this place"),⁴ and (2) a passage in a letter from Douglass to Cadwallader Colden, February 20, 1721:

Colonel Burgess' design of coming over Governor, was the inducement that brought me hither from the prospect of very good business in Bristol; notwithstanding of that disappointment I have resolved to fix here, and ramble no more. I can live handsomely by the incomes of my Practice, and save some small matter.⁵

the same, *An Historical Account of the Small-Pox Inoculated* (London, 1726), 1-4 (2d ed., Boston, 1730, 1-3); [Isaac Greenwood,] *A Friendly Debate; or, A Dialogue between Academicus; and Sawny & Mundungus* (Boston, 1722), 4-5, 9-10. The *Friendly Debate* was certainly inspired by Mather and probably in part written by him.

¹ 2 *Proceedings*, I. 44 (cf. his *History of Medicine in Massachusetts*, 1881, 64).

² *A Friendly Debate*, 19.

³ P. 20.

⁴ See p. 423, note 5, *supra*.

⁵ 4 *Collections*, II. 164. Bullock (266) utilizes this passage, but he ignores the significant mention of Burgess's "design," which suggests rather 1715 than 1716 (see p. 425, note 2, *infra*).

If Elizeus Burges's *design* of "coming over Governor" of Massachusetts was what brought Douglass to these shores, his first arrival in Boston, with letters of introduction to the ministers,¹ must have taken place in 1715 or (at the latest) in the early part of 1716.² Thus we can easily reconcile the fact that

¹ On Douglass's friendly reception by the Boston ministers, see the "Quære" at the end of Increase Mather's tract *Some Further Account from London, of the Small-Pox Inoculated* (2d ed., Boston, 1721[-2], 7). Where Douglass got his medical degree is not known. I find his name, however ("Gulielmus Douglass") under the year 1711 in the *Album Studiosorum* of the University of Utrecht (Utrecht, 1886, col. 113). That he studied in Paris and Leyden is ascertained from *Summary*, II. 21, note (see Jennison, 196; Bullock, 266). What Jennison says (196, 237, note 7) about "Alexander Sandiland" (misprinted "Samdelande") and "James Stewart" has misled Bullock (267, note 3). Douglass's friend and correspondent was *Alexander* (not James) *Stuart*. To him he wrote from Boston on September 21, 1721, on the subject of inoculation (see p. 423, note 5, *supra*), and the letter was read before the Royal Society on November 16th (*Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, xiv. 103). For other letters from Douglass to Alexander Stuart see p. 457, note 4, *infra*. He twice refers to his former intimacy with Stuart (*Publications*, as above, xiv. 106, note 3), and in the second instance (which occurs in the dedication of his *Practical Essay concerning the Small Pox*, Boston, 1730) he is rather specific: "Our former Intimacy in the Universities in Holland and Hospitals in Flanders, inclined me to this Address." As for "Dr. Alexander Sandilande" (in [Isaac Greenwood's] *Friendly Debate*, I, cf. 10), that is, I take it, merely Greenwood's (or Mather's) satirical nickname for Dr. Alexander Stuart, just as "Sawny" is their nickname for Douglass.

² Burges's commission was dated March 17, 1714-15. He resigned in the following spring, not having come to New England at all. As early as April 12, 1716, his resignation was known in London, and by the 20th it was known there that his successor, Samuel Shute, had been appointed by the King (*Boston News-Letter*, June 11 and 16, 1716). Shute's commission was dated June 13 or 15, 1716. It had been approved by the Privy Council on May 17th (*Acts of the Privy Council*, Colonial, 1680-1720, 799). Between June 2 and 5, 1716, the news that Burges was not coming reached Boston (*Massachusetts House Journal*, 3, 6, 7). These facts I owe to Mr. Albert Matthews.

From the letter to Colden (quoted in the text) it is clear that Douglass was in Boston when his "disappointment" took place, — that is, of course, when the news of Burges's resignation and Shute's succession arrived in June, 1716. And, indeed, we see by his weather record (*Summary*, II. 210) that he was here on June 26. Now he himself avers that Shute was appointed on March 14, 1715-16 (*ib.* I. 479). Accurate or not, this statement (taken in connection with the letter) suffices to prove that Douglass had left Bristol and sailed for Boston before that date. The following extract from the ms. Entry Book of the Scots Charitable Society of Boston, February 7, 1715-16 (furnished by the kindness of Mr. F. L. Gay), brings us still nearer to the date of his arrival: "Do^r W^m Douglas M: D: enters & gives £1 .. 0 .. 0."

In the *Summary*, I. 1, Douglass speaks of his "Thirty Years Residence in these Colonies." This passage was written in 1746 (see I. 59, where 1746 is called "this Year"). Again (I. 110) he refers to himself as having come to New England in his twenty-fifth year ("25 Æt.") and as having pursued his investigations here "for a Course of thirty Years." This passage appears to have been written

Mather had read Timonius before July 12, 1716, with the well-authenticated statements that No. 339 of the *Philosophical Transactions* was lent to him by Douglass. But what was the voyage that Douglass took after his first arrival, — the voyage from which, according to Greenwood, he “soon returned”? A casual remark in Douglass’s *Summary* answers the question satisfactorily: “*Anno* 1717 peaceable Times, when I was in *Barbados*, all along its Lee-Shore was a Breast-Work and Trench, in which at proper Places were 29 Forts and Batteries, having 308 Cannon mounted.”¹ Accepting Dr. Green’s date of 1718² as that of the year in which Douglass came back to

in 1747 and before July 8 (cf. I. 80, note, 94, 99, note, 120). In the latter instance, at least, “thirty” appears to be a round number. However, in another letter to Colden (November 20, 1727), Douglass aims at exactitude: “I have,” he says, “for these twelve years last past, made my observations and minutes of those who lead and of those who are led, of all the shelves and rocks on which Gov. Shute and our several parties and factions have run foul” (4 *Collections*, II. 175-176). Taken strictly, these words would indicate arrival in the autumn of 1715. But in another place, he seems to give 1716 as the date of his advent: “As to the Decay of our Cod-fishery, I shall only mention that *Anno* 1716 upon my first Arrival in *New-England*, by the Books of the two Custom-House Districts of *Massachusetts-Bay* were exported 120,384 Quintals,” etc. (*Summary*, I. 540). But this statement is not really inconsistent with a belief that he came over late in 1715.

On the whole, we are safe in fixing upon the latter part of 1715 or the early part of 1716 as the date of Douglass’s first arrival in Boston.

¹ *Summary*, I. 133 (Boston, 1749). In a letter to Colden (November 20, 1727), Douglass mentions his having entered certain “large spacious caves” in Barbados (4 *Collections*, II. 174). Bullock, 266, note 2, cites these two places, but he has missed *Summary*, I. 121, note (which seems to allude to the visit to Barbados), and I. 90 (where Douglass speaks of having “transiently visited” the French West Indies). Clearly, Jennison had seen this passage, though he did not cite it (p. 196). Douglass’s departure for the West Indies did not take place before the spring of 1717, for he was still in Boston on February 22 (*Summary*, II. 212, 213).

² Jennison (p. 196) gives the following account of Douglass’s settling in Boston: “In June, 1716, he came to Boston from Philadelphia. During the year 1717, he visited the French and English islands in the West Indies, and returned to Boston in 1718.” Most of these statements appear to rest on remarks in the *Summary* or on inferences therefrom. Unfortunately Jennison does not cite the passages, and the *Summary* is an unindexed wilderness. Bullock, who accepts Jennison’s dates (omitting “June,” but keeping 1716), supplies some of the references, and I have found others. “From Philadelphia” appears to be an error. Douglass came to New England (doubtless Boston) from Bristol in Old England (see p. 424, *supra*). “June” seems to be an unwarrantable inference from *Summary*, II. 210 (see p. 425, note 2, *supra*). For the visit to the West Indies, see note I, *supra*. I do not know Jennison’s authority for 1718 as the date of Douglass’s return, but it is probably correct. According to the records of the Scots Charitable Society of Boston (as Mr. Gay informs me), Douglass paid his quarterly dues on May 1 and August 7, 1716. He disappears from the record at the

Boston and "took up his abode" here permanently, we find that everything is in order. His loan of No. 347 of the *Transactions* (containing Pylarinus) may have taken place in 1716 (after the date of Mather's letter of July 12), or at some subsequent time.

After all, it is a matter of slight consequence (except for the necessity of harmonizing the testimony of our witnesses) whether Mather borrowed Timonius and Pylarinus from Douglass or received them by post from London. But it *is* of some interest to observe that, before July 12, 1716, he had read Timonius, noting how the Constantinople physician substantiated the story of Onesimus, and that he could write on that day to Dr. Woodward: "For my own part, if I should live to see y^e *Small-Pox* again enter into o^r City, I would immediately procure a Consult of o^r Physicians, to Introduce a Practice, which may be of so very happy a Tendency." With these words in mind, we turn with some satisfaction to Mather's *Diary* of almost five years later (May 26, 1721) and read an entry drawn up in almost identical terms:

The grievous Calamity of the *Small-Pox* has now entered the Town. The Practice of conveying and suffering the *Small-pox* by *Inoculation*, has never been used in *America*, nor indeed in our Nation. But how many Lives might be saved by it, if it were practised? I will procure a Consult of our Physicians, and lay the matter before them.¹

For it is now evident that, when Cotton Mather urged inoculation upon the attention of the Boston physicians in 1721, he was not acting upon a sudden and whimsical impulse, he was not plunging headlong into an unconsidered experiment on the strength of something he had just come across in a scientific journal. On the contrary, he was proceeding in accordance with a matured plan, — he was carrying out a resolution which he had formed and announced *five years before*. The significance of this fact requires no emphasis.

quarterly meeting, November 6, 1716, but reappears on November 18, 1718, and pays his back dues (nine quarters). He was in Boston on October 14, 1719, as his meteorological observations show: "1719, October 14, Hard Frost as if Mid-winter, Robins disappear. This Winter I walked round *Boston Peninsula* at a quick Pace upon the Ice, without all the Wharfs, in one Hour seven Minutes" (*Summary*, II. 214).

¹ *Diary*, II. 620-621.

Mather's first move in his campaign for inoculation was to frame an *Address to the Physicians of Boston*, exhorting them to meet and pass judgment on the novel practice. The *Address* was dated June 6, 1721.¹ It was circulated in manuscript among the doctors, — not published, — but most of it soon got into print, as we shall see presently, and the residue (except for a few sentences) is probably still extant in the author's own handwriting.

The bulk of Mather's *Address* consisted of an abstract of Timonius and Pylarinus, and this was soon published by Zabdiel Boylston, with Mather's approval and assistance. Furthermore, the peroration of the *Address*, advising that the new method "be warily proceeded in," was twice quoted in the 1722, — once in *A Vindication of the Ministers*² and once in Isaac Greenwood's *Friendly Debate*.³ Thus we possess almost the whole of the *Address* in type. Before we search for the residue, we must scrutinize the above-mentioned publication of Zabdiel Boylston.

On August 4, 1721, Mather remarks in his *Diary*: "I will allow the persecuted Physician, to publish my Communications from the *Levant*, about the *Small-Pox*, and supply him with some further Armour, to conquer the Dragon."⁴ And again, on August 25th, he writes: "I will assist my Physician, in giving to the Public, some Accounts about relieving the *Small-Pox* in the way of *Transplantation*; which may be of great Consequence!"⁵ Both entries manifestly refer to a tract which ap-

¹ The date is ascertained from two sources: *A Vindication of the Ministers* (Boston, 1722), 7, and [Greenwood's] *Friendly Debate*, 6. I adopt the title *Address* (instead of *Letter*) to the Physicians for the sake of clearness. Either term appears to be correct.

² *A Vindication of the Ministers of Boston, from the Abuses & Scandals, lately cast upon them, in Diverse Printed Papers. By Some of their People* (Boston, 1722), 7-8. This pamphlet (like Greenwood's *Friendly Debate*) was at least inspired by Mather (see *Diary*, II. 672, 674).

³ Pp. 5-6.

⁴ *Diary*, II. 636.

⁵ *Ib.* II. 639. "My Physician," in this passage, does not refer to Mather's family physician, John Perkins (as to whom we may consult the *Diary*, II. 609, 620, 627, 664), but to Zabdiel Boylston. Mather here employs *my* in a sense derived from a special use of the Latin *meus* ("my dear," "my esteemed," etc.). So, in a letter to Jurin, May 21, 1723 (printed by N. Darnell Davis in *The Nation*, New York, February 18, 1892, LIV. 128, and in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register*, XLVI. 115), Mather speaks of Dr. John Woodward, of London, as "my Doctor."

peared in August or September, 1721: *Some Account of what is said of Inoculating or Transplanting the Small Pox. By the Learned Dr. Emanuel Timonius, and Jacobus Pylarinus. With some Remarks thereon. To which are added, A Few Quæries in Answer to the Scruples of many about the Lawfulness of this Method. Published by Dr. Zabdiel Boylstone.*¹

The tract contains twenty-two pages, besides the title-leaf. On the verso of the title-page is an introductory note, apparently by Boylston. Then follows (on pp. 1-8) "A Faithful Abridgment" of Timonius and Pylarinus, taken (as the introductory note informs us) from Mather's *Address to the Physicians*.² Next (on pp. 8-17) comes a series of "Remarks," mostly of a medical character. And finally (on pp. 18-22), we have "A Few Quæries humbly Offered," which are designed for the satisfaction of scrupulous consciences. Thus the Boylston tract falls into three parts. Part One (the abstract) is known to be Cotton Mather's. Who wrote the other two?

That Mather had a hand in one or both of them is antecedently probable, and is further indicated by the entries in his Diary for August 4 and 25, already quoted. For there he signifies his purpose to "supply" Boylston with "further Armour" (besides the Abstract) and to "assist" him in "giving to the Public some Accounts." The "Quæries" (Part Three) may unhesitatingly be ascribed to Mather alone; for they are not only in his style, but they also concern a vital department of his own profession. Religious scruples, as everybody is aware, prompted much of the hostility that inoculation encountered. Such scruples it was the function of a minister to remove. Nor was Cotton Mather likely to delegate this duty to a mere

¹ The date of publication as here indicated (August or September, 1721) may be established without recourse to Mather's *Diary*. (1) The tract mentions the case of Esther Webb (p. 17), and we know that she was inoculated on August 5 (Boylston, *Historical Account*, 2d ed., 1730, 7). (2) When the tract was issued, no inoculated person had yet died. The first death was that of Mrs. Dixwell, which occurred on September 24 (the same, 10). Comparing the *Diary* for August 25, we can fix the date with security as between August 25 and the 24th of September. The spelling of Boylston's name on the title-page differs in different copies. In the copy in the Harvard College Library it is *Boylstone*; in the M. H. S. copy, *Boylston*.

² "But because the *Gentleman* who only hath these Letters by him, refuses now to lend them; the Account here following is chiefly taken from a known *Letter* written by a Learned Gentleman of *Boston* to the Worthy Physicians of the Town" (p. [ii]).

physician.¹ I shall not waste time, therefore, in arguing what is manifestly "a most pregnant and unforced position," but shall reclaim pp. 18-22 for Mather without more ado. Thus we are left with only Part Two of the Boylston tract to account for, — the section headed "Remarks" (pp. 8-17). The "Remarks" (like the "Quæries") have usually been credited to Boylston, and it is clear that he is responsible for some of them (in substance, if not in form²), but others are certainly Mather's own, and the whole was probably redacted by his skilful pen.

One passage in particular may be claimed for Mather without any qualifications whatever, and it is a passage that ought to be restored to its rightful owner, since it tells of investigations for which credit should be properly assigned. It runs as follows:

There is at this Time a considerable Number of *Africans* in this Town, who can have no Conspiracy or Combination to cheat us. No body has instructed them to tell their Story. The more plainly, brokenly, and blunderingly, and like Ideots, they tell their Story, it will be with reasonable Men, but the much more credible. For *that these all agree in one Story*; 'That abundance of poor Negro's die of the *Small Pox*, till they learn this *Way*; that People take the Juice of the *Small Pox*, and *Cut the Skin*, and put in a drop; then by'nd by a little *Sick*, then few *Small Pox*; and no body dye of it: no body have *Small Pox* any more.

Here we have a clear Evidence, that in *Africa*, where the Poor Creatures dye of the *Small Pox* in the common way like Rotten Sheep, a Merciful GOD has taught them a *wonderful Preservative*.

It is a *Common Practice*, and is attended with *Success*. I have as full Evidence of this, as I have that there are *Lions* in *Africa*. And I don't know why 'tis more unlawful to learn of *Africans*, how to help against the *Poison* of the *Small Pox*, than it is to learn of our *Indians*, how to help against the *Poison* of a *Rattle-Snake*.³

¹ Mather is known to be the author of *A Letter to a Friend in the Country, Attempting a Solution of the Scruples & Objections of a Conscientious or Religious Nature, commonly made against the New Way of receiving the Small-Pox. By a Minister of Boston*. Boston, 1721. This tract is dated at the end, November 20, 1721. Mr. Tuttle suggests (with much probability) that an entry in the *Diary* for November 9, 1721 (II. 656) relates to it.

² So, for instance, when he cites his own experience with his patients (pp. 11, 12, 13, 16, 17).

³ P. 9.

There are several arguments ¹ (including the test of style) on which this picturesque and animated piece of writing, with its early specimen of Negro English, might more probably be attributed to Cotton Mather than to Zabdiel Boylston. But one need not balance probabilities, since conclusive proof is available: the passage turns up, almost word for word, in the holograph manuscript of Mather's *Angel of Bethesda*. For reasons that will become obvious as we proceed, I shall begin my extract from the *Angel* at a point a little anterior to the moment of first coincidence:

There has been a *Wonderful Practice* lately used in Several Parts of the World, which indeed is not yett become common in o^r Nation.

I was first instructed in it, by a *Guramantee-Servant* of my own, long before I knew, that any *Europeans* or *Asiaticks* had the least Acquaintance with it; and some years ² before I was enriched with the Communications of the learned Foreigners, whose Accounts I found agreeing with what I received of my Servant, when he shewed me the Scar of the Wound made for the Operation; and said, That no Person ever died of the *Small-pox* in their Countrey that had the Courage to use it.

I have since mett with a considerable Number of these *Africans*, who all agree in One Story; That in their Countrey *grandy-many* dy of the *Small-Pox*: But now they learn This Way: People take Juice of *Small-Pox*; and *Cutty-skin*, and Putt in a Drop; then by'nd by a little *Sicky, Sicky*: then very few little things like *Small-Pox*; and no body dy of it; and no body have *Small-Pox* any more. Thus in *Africa*, where the Poor Creatures dy of the *Small-Pox* like Rotten Sheep, a Merciful GOD has taught them an *Infallible Præ-*

¹ For example, the retort about snakeroot as a remedy is quite in Mather's vein. He had mentioned this specific on November 18, 1712, in a letter to Dr. Woodward (*Royal Society Letter-Book*, M. 2. 22; Gay MS., fol. 34), which had been excerpted in the *Philosophical Transactions*, No. 339 (xxix. 64), — the very number that includes the paper of Timonius. And on September 24, 1716, he had sent a specimen of the plant to James Petiver, F.R.S., the distinguished botanist (see the original draught, M. H. S., and the letter itself among Petiver's papers in the British Museum, Sloane MS. 4065, fol. 255). Petiver acknowledged the gift, in 1717, in his *Petiveriana III* (p. 12, col. 2), registering the plant as "*Ophiophuga*, *Cottonis* Mather."

² In his letter of July 12, 1716, Mather says, in effect, that he got his information from Onesimus "many months" before he read Timonius (p. 422, *supra*). When Pylarinus came into his hands we do not know, but certainly after this letter of 1716 was written. "Some years" is either a synonym for "many months," or else (in the *Angel*) Mather is referring to the interval between his first talk with Onesimus and his perusal of Pylarinus.

servative. Tis a common Practice, and is attended with a *Constant Success*.¹

On comparing this extract from Mather's *Angel of Bethesda* with the passage just quoted from Part Two of the Boylston tract, we are immediately struck by their word-for-word agreement for a considerable portion of their extent. We observe, however, a significant difference, — the use of the pronoun *I* in the *Angel*. In the printed tract the reader is not informed who it was that interrogated the Boston negroes. In the *Angel*, on the contrary, which was to be an acknowledged work, Mather begins the paragraph in question with an outspoken *I*: "I have since ² mett with a considerable Number of these *Africans*, who all agree in One Story." Further, he brings his conversations with the negroes into close relation (logical and chronological) with the disclosures of Onesimus, of which he had given Dr. Woodward an account in 1716.³

Our comparison, then, establishes two facts: (1) Mather, not Boylston, was the inquirer who gathered and collated the fragmentary *testimonia* of the Boston Africans, and (2) Mather, by whom (as we have seen) the First and Third Parts of the Boylston tract were composed, had also a hand in Part Two. In a word, practically the whole of the tract is from Mather's pen, though Boylston collaborated with him in the Second Part. Boylston's contributions, at the most liberal estimate, cannot amount to more than four or five pages,⁴ and all or most of these were doubtless redacted by Mather. We now discern the reason why Boylston appears on the title-page, not as the *author* of the pamphlet, but merely as the person who "published" it, — that is, in modern parlance, who *issued* it, or made it public.⁵

¹ *Angel of Bethesda* (MS., A. A. S.), Chap. xx. p. 134.

² That is, since his conversation with Onesimus.

³ The language of *The Angel of Bethesda* here agrees closely with that of the letter to Woodward (see p. 422, *supra*).

⁴ I do not attempt to appraise the comparative merit or value of Mather's and Boylston's share in the volume. Far be it from me to belittle the first-hand observations which Boylston contributed! Boylston and Mather fought shoulder to shoulder, and each was ever liberal in giving credit to the other.

⁵ So Daniel Neal, in 1722, cites a certain tract which Jeremiah Dummer received from New England in manuscript, and gave to the world in that year with a dedication to Sir Hans Sloane, as "a letter from *New England* lately publish'd by Mr. *Dummer*" (see Neal's *Historical Introduction*, prefixed to *A Narrative of*

Our study of the Boylston tract has diverted our attention from Mather's *Address to the Physicians*. Two fragments of this, as we have seen, got into print in 1721, — (1) the summary of Timonius and Pylarinus, which Boylston took from the *Address* and inserted in the tract that he "published"; and (2) the peroration, which was quoted by Greenwood and in the *Vindication of the Ministers*. Thus only the introductory portion of the *Address* remains to be discovered. Let us turn again to *The Angel of Bethesda*.

The passage first quoted from this work ("There has been a *Wonderful Practice* lately used," etc.) begins a particular division of Chapter XX, and exactly fills p. 134 of the manuscript. P. 135 continues with a transitional sentence: "But o^r Advice of this Matter, as it comes from Superiour Persons in the *Levant*, is what may have most Attention given to it." Next comes (on pp. 135-140) Mather's summary of Timonius and Pylarinus, almost word for word from the *Address to the Physicians*. There follow (on pp. 140-141) a few sentences of ætiological speculation, and then (on p. 141) comes a peroration (closing with the words "I have done") which one instantly recognizes as adapted from that of the *Address*. The inference is not to be resisted: the *introductory portion of the Address to the Physicians is not lost; it is substantially preserved in The Angel of Bethesda* (p. 134), where it serves (as it served in the *Address*) to lead up to the summary of Timonius and Pylarinus. In other words, the *Address to the Physicians* was inserted by Mather, in practical entirety, into *The Angel of Bethesda*, where it may still be read on pp. 134-141.

Our inference is confirmed (if confirmation be necessary) by a singular fact. I have said that this portion of Chapter XX of *The Angel of Bethesda* concludes (on p. 141) with a peroration adapted from that which closed the *Address to the Physicians*. Let me hasten to add that, in the manuscript of the *Angel*, Mather has cancelled this peroration with his pen, and has substituted for it a briefer ending in the margin. His reason for the change becomes clear as soon as one reads the cancelled passage. I print it below, arranged in parallel columns with the peroration of the *Address*.

the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small Pox . . . By Mr. Benj. Colman, p. 6).

Angel of Bethesda

(Cancelled passage on p. 141)

I durst not engage, that the Success of the Trial here, will be the Same, that has been in all the *other Countreys* where it has been tried hitherto:¹

Nor am I sure, that if it should be made upon a Body, where the *Blood* is already upon the Point of some unhappy *Fever*, this may not help to sett *Fire* to such a Thing. But I am very Confident, no Person would miscarry in it but what *must most certainly* have miscarried upon taking the Contagion in the common way. Wherefore, if it be made at all,² I advise, that it be never made

Peroration of the *Address*(as quoted in Greenwood's *Friendly Debate*, 5-6).

I will only say that inasmuch as the practice of suffering the Small-Pox in the way of *Inoculation*, has never yet, as far as I have heard, been introduced into our Nation where there are so many that would give great Sums to have their Lives ensured for an Escape from the Dangers of this dreadful Distemper; nor has ever any one in *America*, ever yet made the tryal of it, (tho' we have several *Africans* among us, as I now find, who tryed it in their own Country,) I *cannot but* move, that it be WARILY proceeded in.

I durst not yet engage that, the *Success* of the Trial here, will be the Same, that has hitherto been in the other Hemisphere:

But I am very confident, no Person would miscarry in it, but what would most certainly have miscarried upon taking the Contagion the *Common Way*: And I would *humbly Advise*, that it be never made but under the man-

¹ The clause "tho' we have seen it succeed well in very different climates" is inserted in the margin and cancelled.

² The words "(and all the Scruples that some have about the *Tempting of Providence* be also gott over)" are inserted in the margin and cancelled.

but under the management of a *Physician* whose Conduct may be much relied upon; and who will wisely *praepare* the Body for it, before he *perform* the Operation. *I have done.*

agement of a Skilful *PHYSICIAN*, who will wisely *prepare*

the Body for it, before he performs the Operation. *Gentlemen*, My request is, That you would meet for a *Consultation* upon this Occasion, and so deliberate upon it, that whoever first begins the practice, (*if you Approve it should be begun at all*) may have the countenance of his worthy Brethren to fortify him in it. *June 6. 1721.*

Comparison shows at a glance that the peroration in *The Angel of Bethesda* is (as I have already noted) adapted from that of the *Address*. Now this whole passage is cancelled in the manuscript, because, when Mather brought the chapter into its present condition, he added (on pp. 142-147 of the manuscript) an account of the successful experiments in Boston, which had not been made when he wrote the cancelled passage. This passage had become obsolete, and therefore he crossed it out.¹

In stating that the *Address to the Physicians* is substantially preserved in pp. 134-141 of *The Angel of Bethesda*, I do not mean to imply that it is literally preserved. We have seen that Mather shortened and adapted the peroration when he inserted it. Doubtless he made some changes in the introductory matter also. But, on the whole, we have good grounds for believing that very little of the *Address* has perished.

One of the most remarkable features of Mather's advocacy of inoculation was his citation of negro testimony. We have found such testimony in his letter of July 12, 1716, in the *Address to the Physicians*, and in the Boylston tract. The credence he gave to it covered him with ridicule. It was the use he made of

¹ In the margin Mather has inserted the following passage to take the place of the cancelled peroration: "But perhaps, y^e Few Words, that I wrote, in my Introducing of y^e Story, may be as much to the purpose, as all of this Jargon. I'll have done with it." The "jargon" is, of course, the ætiological speculation that immediately precedes the cancelled peroration (cf. p. 454, *infra*).

such evidence, I fancy, that instigated the lieutenant of a man-of-war to "call his *Negro-Slave* by the Name of COTTON-MATHER,"¹ rather than the odd motive imagined by the injured party.² Here is a pertinent passage from William Douglass's *Inoculation Consider'd*, published on January 6, 1722:

Their second Voucher is an Army of half a Dozen or half a Score *Africans*, by others call'd *Negro Slave*s, who tell us now (tho' never before) that it is practised in their own Country. The more blundering and *Negroish* they tell their Story, it is the more credible says *C. M.*; a *paradox in Nature*; for all they say true or false is after the same manner. There is not a Race of Men on Earth more *False Lyars*, &c. Their Accounts of what was done in their Country was never depended upon till now for Arguments sake. Many *Negroes* to my knowledge have assured their Masters that they had the Small Pox in their own Country or elsewhere, and have now had it in *Boston*. Some of *Dr. M's Inoculated Army* have had the same Fate, which might serve as an Argument that the *Inoculated* may have the Small Pox afterwards in the common way; but such weak Arguments our cause does not require. To confirm this you have at length in two of their little Books a silly Story or familiar Interview and Conversation between two *black* (*Negro*) *Gentlemen*, and a couple of the *Reverend Promoters*, concerning Inoculation. *O Rare Farce!*³

This diverting outburst tempts one to a commentary. We note, in the first place, that Douglass ascribes to Mather the passage about negroes in the Boylston pamphlet. We do not need his testimony, but it is welcome. Further, he speaks with fine scorn of "an Army of half a Dozen or half a Score Africans." This is a fling at a somewhat hyperbolic phrase in Cotton Mather's *Sentiments on the Small Pox inoculated* (published on November 23, 1721): "We have an army of Africans among

¹ *Diary*, ii. 663.

² "That so they may with some Shadow of Truth, assert Crimes as committed by one of that Name, which the Hearers take to be me" (*Diary*, ii. 706).

³ *Inoculation of the Small Pox as practised in Boston, Consider'd in a Letter to A—— S—— M.D. & F.R.S.* (Boston, 1722), 6-7. This letter to Stuart is dated "Dec. 20. 1721." The day of publication (January 13, 1722) is ascertained from an advertisement signed "Zabdiel Boylston" printed in the *Boston Gazette* of Monday, January 8-15, 1722 (No. 112), in which he speaks of the book as "published last Saturday." The *Courant* for January 1-8, 1722 (No. 23), had announced it for "Thursday next" (January 11), and the same newspaper for January 8-15 (No. 24) advertises it as "Just publish'd."

ourselves, who have themselves been under it, and given us all the assurance, which a rational mind can desire, that it has long been used with like success in Africa.”¹ Finally, Douglass jeers at a “familiar Interview,” described in “two . . . little Books,” between “two black (Negroe) Gentlemen, and a couple of the Reverend Promoters.” Douglass is a careless writer, but we cannot miss his meaning. He is adverting to Mather’s specimens of Negro English in the Boylston pamphlet, and to an extremely interesting story (of some anthropological importance) told by the Rev. Benjamin Colman in his *Observations* (1721).²

Cotton Mather’s *Sentiments* was parodied in the *New-England Courant* for November 27, 1721, and the parodist does not forget the negroes. “A Method of preventing *Death*,” he ironically argues, “which an *Army of Africans* have given us all the Assurance which a rational Mind can desire, that it is used in *Africa* with Success, is not only lawful, but a Duty.”³ Again, in *A Letter from One in the Country* (1721), another anonymous writer remarks, scoffingly:

A certain *Clergy-man* (by the way of *Europe*) received Advice of the Practice among the *Mussel-men*, & faithful people of the prophet *Mahomet*; also more immediately and *viva voce* from some of the scattered Members of the good people in *Guinea*.⁴

Still another anonymous document, *The Imposition of Inoculation as a Duty*, published on New Year’s Day, 1722,⁵ which is

¹ See p. 471, *infra*.

² *Some Observations on the New Method of Receiving the Small-Pox by Ingrafting or Inoculating* (Boston, 1721), 15-16. The dedication is dated “Novemb. 23. 1721.” Greenwood (*A Friendly Debate*, 11) quotes Douglass, and adds: “Now where are those *two Books*: you certainly see *DOUBLE, Sawny*.” But Douglass was ready for him, and replied with exact references: “Vide *Some Account*, &c., p. 9. Mr. Colman p. 15. says *The pleasing and informing Discourse I had with a poor Negro*” (*Postscript to Abuses*, &c. Obviated, 5-6).

³ *Answer to a late Piece in Favour of Inoculation, Courant*, No. 17, for November 20-27, 1721.

⁴ *A Letter from one in the Country, to his Friend in the City: in Relation to their Distresses occasioned by the doubtful and prevailing Practice of the Inoculation of the Small-Pox. Printed for . . . Nicholas Boone . . . And John Edwards . . . 1721.* P. 2. The person to whom this letter is addressed is called “Francis” at the end of the tract: “Dear *Francis*, I bid thee heartily Farewel” (p. 8). In the Harvard College copy two ms. notes in the hand of Dr. Timothy Lindall Jennison (H. C. 1782; M.D. 1824; died 1845) identify him with Dr. Francis Archbald, a Boston physician of the time.

⁵ *The Imposition of Inoculation as a Duty Religiously Considered in a Letter to*

particularly severe on the Boylston tract and on Cotton Mather's *Sentiments*, is adorned with a motto from Pliny: "*Aliquid Monstri semper profert AFRICA.*" The author, echoing a phrase of Mather's in the Boylston tract, speaks ironically of "the *New Scheme* of those *Judicious people* call'd *Africans*, who had no *Combination* to cheat us."¹ And again he contends that "to bring Armies of *Africans*, and Troops of *Mahometans*, to prove it lawful by their Success with it, is like their proving the Religion of *Mahomet*, as true Religion, because successfully propagated, and maintained by the Sword, and profest by vast Numbers, which fill whole Nations of the *Eastern World.*"²

But Mather was not to be laughed out of his justifiable confidence in the Africans, or his equally justifiable pride in having learned of inoculation from Onesimus before he saw the essay of Timonius. He insisted on both these points, as we have seen,³ in his *Angel of Bethesda*, which was ready for the press on February 20, 1724,⁴ and which, in the following October, he was hoping to get published in America.⁵ Previously, in a long letter to Dr. James Jurin (May 4, 1723), he had expressed himself as follows:

But we find likewise an Army of *Africans*, among o^r Domestic Slaves, to be our Auxiliaries in this Cause, who had the Operation Performed upon them, while they were yett in *Barbary*; and as they show y^e Marks of it, so we as well as they reap the *Fruits* of it, in their Secure Attendance upon o^r Sick. And we understand, That in *Barbary*, the Common Usage is this: when about half a Dozen in a Village fall Sick of y^e *Small-Pox*, presently all y^e Sound at once repair unto them to be furnished with the *Pus*, for y^e *Inoculation* of the *Small-Pox* upon them; All of whom, after a Small Indisposition, have a few Pustules, which forever secure them from y^e Distemper; Whereas, the first Half a Dozen generally dy;⁶ yea, the Poor a Gentleman in the Country Incl'in'd to admit it. Printed for Nicholas Boone . . . And John Edwards . . . 1721. It is advertised in the *Courant* of January 1, 1722 (No. 22), as "This Day published."

¹ P. 3.² P. 25.³ P. 431, *supra*.⁴ *Diary*, II. 608.⁵ In an inedited letter to Dr. James Jurin, October 5, 1724, Mather describes this book as "a work of above Thirty sheets," gives the title-page, and adds: "I may shortly attempt the publication of this Treatise in this Country" (*Royal Society Letter-Book*, M. 2. 56; Gay MS., fols. 254-255).⁶ Compare an anonymous communication (*A Faithful Account*, etc.) printed in the *Gazette* for October 23-30, 1721 (No. 101): "In *Africa*, the manner is,

Negro's generally Dy like rotten Sheep, when y^e *Small-Pox* gets among them, and this *Method of Safety* is not practised.¹

And in another tract, prepared when the controversy was at its height, Mather repeats the Onesimus story, adds the testimony of "a Number of Africans," and asserts in plain terms that "some Years after he had receiv'd his first *African* Informations, he found publish'd in our *Philosophical Transactions*, divers Communications from the *Levant*, which, to our Surprise, agreed with what he had from *Africa*." ²

Mather has always been accused of credulity. This time his easy faith was a better guide than Douglass's haughty contempt for unschooled empiricism. Inoculation was not taught to the people by the physicians. It was an old bit of medical folk-lore, which the doctors at last condescended to respect, as Jenner, many years afterwards, learned vaccination from a milkmaid. As for Douglass, who was never tired of calling Mather credulous, one feels a certain pleasure in hearing Hutchinson retort the adjective against him. Dr. Douglass, writes Hutchinson, "was credulous and easily received idle reports."³ It is likewise rather exhilarating to find that Douglass's friend Cadwallader Colden, as late as 1753, rediscovered the fact that negroes from Africa had a story to tell about inoculation. Colden writes as follows in a letter of October 1st in that year:

It has been commonly believed, that inoculation of the small pox was an invention of the Circassians. . . . But from what follows, it seems probable, that the practice is much older, and that it came from Africa originally, with the distemper itself. I have lately learned from my negroes, that it is a common practice in their country, so that seldom any old people have the disease. . . . It will be

That in a Village, where the *Small Pox* has already seized upon six or seven Families, and it is like to spread; presently all the rest of the Town at once, fetch the *Inoculation* from them. The Families first Infected, generally dye; But the *Inoculated Live*." Cf. p. 460, *infra*.

¹ From Mather's original draught (unpublished) in the possession of the American Antiquarian Society, p. 13. The title runs: "The Case of the Small-Pox Inoculated; further Cleared. To D^r James Jurin." Mather mentions this document in letters to Jurin on May 21 and August 3, 1723, and October 5, 1724 (*Royal Society Letter-Book*, M. 2. 36, 45, 56; Gay MS., fols. 178, 211, 255).

² *An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small-Pox in Boston in New-England* (London, 1722), 1-2 (dated at the end, "Sept. 7, 1721"). This tract is certainly by Mather, as will be shown presently (pp. 444 ff., *infra*).

³ *History*, 2d ed., 1768, II. 273.

tended as a communication to the Royal Society.¹ Another, we may conjecture, was the *Little Treatise*, which may well have been finished in the meantime.

However this may be, there are good grounds for believing that the *Little Treatise* was sooner or later brought to an end, and that, though never published, it is still extant in Mather's own handwriting.

We note, in the first place, that the contents of the *Little Treatise*, as they are specified in the *Diary*, fit to a nicety the scheme of *The Angel of Bethesda* outlined by Mather on December, 26, 1720, in a letter to John Winthrop (H. C. 1700). "I am at this time," so runs the letter, "at work upon an Essay, which I shall entitle, THE ANGEL OF BETHESDA." By "essay" Mather does not mean a brief tract, for, on the same occasion, he informs his correspondent that "the Book will be more than a Dozen sheets, and the publication will be expensive."² The plan is thus sketched: "I do upon most of the Distempers commonly afflicting the children of Men, offer the *Sentiments of Piety*, which the Distempered are thereby the most Naturally, and Rationally and Religiously to be led unto. But then upon each Article, I subjoin such powerful and parable specificks, as in my Reading or otherwise, I have mett withal for the cure of these Maladies; with proper cautions upon occasions."³

Collating this programme with the description of the *Little Treatise* in the *Diary* (fortunately a full and precise description), we are struck by the exactness with which they correspond. The *Little Treatise* on the smallpox consisted of three parts or sections: the first was to "awaken the Sentiments of *Piety*, which it calls for"; the second to "exhibit the best Medicines and Methods"; and the third to "add the new Discovery," — inoculation. We know that Mather was engaged upon *The Angel of Bethesda* from December, 1720 (the date of the letter to Winthrop), until February, 1724 (when he records its completion).⁴

¹ The date at the end is June 10, 1721. Cf. *Diary*, June 15, 1721 (II. 626-627). The tract was published at Boston between June 22 and 26 (see *News-Letter*, No. 906). See also *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XIV. 95, note 2.

² Later it grew to thirty sheets (see p. 438, note 5, *supra*).

³ 4 *Collections*, VIII. 445-446.

⁴ *Diary*, February 20, 1724 (II. 698): "My large Work, entituled, THE ANGEL OF BETHESDA, is now finished." Evidence of Mather's continual occupation with the book may be seen in letters to Winthrop, February 12 and April 23, 1722,

Manifestly the *Little Treatise* (whether or not it should get into type in the interim) was to form a part of *The Angel of Bethesda* whenever that extensive work should be offered to the public.

We turn, therefore, to the manuscript of the *Angel* with high hopes of finding something that shall agree in form and contents with the *Little Treatise*. Nor are we disappointed. What we seek lies before us in Chapter XX, which is entitled "*Variolæ triumphatæ. The SMALL-POX Encountred.*"¹

The chapter, though not formally so divided, falls, on inspection, into two well-marked portions of unequal length (pp. 112-141 and pp. 142-147). These I shall call, for convenience, Part One and Part Two. Part One (pp. 112-141) was composed, as internal evidence proves, *after* the epidemic of 1721 was under way, but *before* Zabdiel Boylston had performed his first inoculation, — that is, before June 26, 1721.² It is (or rather, *was*) complete in itself, for it ends some distance from the bottom of p. 141 with the words "*I have done.*" These words, however, are cancelled, and the Chapter goes on to Part Two (pp. 142-147). Part Two was manifestly written after November 14, 1721, for it mentions, near the beginning,³ the attempt to assassinate Mather by means of a "*fired Granado.*"⁴ For the present, then, we must concentrate our attention on Part One (pp. 112-141).

This portion of the chapter, since it was composed before June 26, 1721, may be expected to coincide, to some extent, with the *Little Treatise* which Mather, as the *Diary* indicates, was preparing (and doubtless had nearly finished) on the 22d of that month, and which we have seen some reason to believe he sent to England on or about the 29th. Expectation is not deceived. The coincidence is so complete as to be almost startling.

The *Little Treatise*, we remember, is described in the *Diary* as consisting of three sections: (1) "the sentiments of piety"; (2) "the best medicines and methods"; (3) inoculation. There

January 10, 1723, and April-June, 1723 (4 *Collections*, VIII. 450, 452, 454, cf. p. 469, note 4, *infra*).

¹ See p. 455, note 1, *infra*.

² Boylston, *Historical Account*, London, 1726, 2 (2d ed., 1730, p. 2).

³ MS., p. 142: "I myself had thrown into my House in the Dead of the Night, a fired *Granado*," etc.

⁴ The grenade was thrown into Mather's house about 3 o'clock, A. M., November 14, 1721 (*Diary*, II. 657).

could be no more accurate description of Part One of Chapter XX. I append an analysis:

I. Pages 112-119 of *The Angel of Bethesda* are devoted to religious reflections on the smallpox. The test-phrase "sentiments of piety" occurs with emphasis on p. 113: — "*The Sentiments of PIETY* to be raised in & from this *Grievous Disease*, are what I am first & most of all to be now concerned for." The section ends in the middle of p. 119, the lower half of which is blank.

II. Pages 120-133 are devoted to methods and medicines. The "Sydenhamian Method" of treating smallpox¹ is expounded in twenty "aphorisms," which are followed by therapeutic material from Woodman, Pitcairn, and Woodward.² The beginning of this section is actually designated by a Roman numeral "II" (p. 120). The section ends at the bottom of p. 132. The next page (133) is blank at the top and bottom, but contains, in the middle, a few sentences which effect a transition to the third section.

III. Pages 134-141 are marked off as a distinct section by the title "Appendix" at the top of p. 134. They treat solely and merely of inoculation. The section begins: "There has been a *Wonderful Practice* lately used in Several Parts of the World, which indeed is not yett become common in o^r Nation." Mather then tells how he was "first instructed in it" by his "*Guramantee-Servant*," — "some years" before he read Timonius and Pylarinus; cites the concurrent testimony of "a Considerable Number" of Africans;³ and goes on to give his abstract of Timonius and Pylarinus, — the same that he had previously embodied in his *Address to the Physicians*.⁴ Then, after a short but sturdy flight in the regions of speculative ætiology, he closes (on p. 141) with a peroration adapted

¹ Mather had become acquainted with this method in 1702, and had then "pressed the Physicians to come into it, and the Success was answerable. Few died in comparison of the numbers formerly destroyed" (*Letter to Woodward*, July 12, 1716).

² The Woodward material seems to have been inserted after the rest of this part of the Chapter had been composed. It is labelled "Mantissa" and is on a sheet that differs in size from the others. It occupies pp. 130-132. The fourth page of the sheet (133) contains transitional matter leading up to the treatment of inoculation.

³ See p. 431, *supra*, for Mather's exact words.

⁴ Our knowledge of the shape which the abstract wore in the *Address* is derived from the Boylston tract, in which (as the introduction avers) that abstract is "chiefly taken" from the *Address*. The differences between the text in the Boylston tract and the text in the *Angel* are slight. The most notable variation consists in the presence of certain Latin quotations in the *Angel*. These doubtless stood in the *Address*, but were omitted in the Boylston tract because the latter was meant for the general reader.

from that of the same *Address* and ending with the words "I have done." Thus, at some distance from the bottom of the page, the section is concluded, and with it Part One of Chapter XX.

The analysis speaks for itself and makes further argument nugatory. The *Little Treatise* described in Mather's *Diary* for June 22, 1721, is not lost; it lies before us in pp. 112-141 of *The Angel of Bethesda*. So much may now be taken as proved.

Another fact emerges from the analysis. In composing the *Little Treatise* toward the end of June, Mather utilized, for his account of inoculation, the *Address to the Physicians* which he had prepared early in the month. For pp. 134-141 of *The Angel of Bethesda* (which coincide with the third section of the *Little Treatise*) have already been fully considered by us and have turned out to be nothing more or less than an adaptation of the famous *Address*.¹

Thus we have a wheel within a wheel. The *Address to the Physicians* was incorporated in the *Little Treatise* when the latter was composed, on or about June 22, 1721; and, somewhat later, the *Little Treatise* (including the *Address*) was incorporated in Chapter XX of *The Angel of Bethesda*, forming Part One of that Chapter (pp. 112-141). In these successive acts of incorporation a few changes and some cancellations were of course necessary, but they were trifling, and in no wise interfere with our experiments in the higher criticism.²

To the Part Two of Chapter XX (pp. 142-147) we shall have occasion to revert in due season. Meantime another "lost work" of Cotton Mather awaits us.

III. AN ACCOUNT OF THE METHOD AND SUCCESS OF INOCULATING THE SMALL-POX.

What passes for a lost work of Cotton Mather appears under his name in Dr. Haven's list for 1721:³ "An Account of the Method and further Success of Inoculating for the Small Pox

¹ See pp. 433 ff., *supra*.

² Mr. Ford finds a probable hint of *The Angel of Bethesda* in Mather's *Diary* as early as 1693 (i. 163); but the first mention of it as a settled project occurs in a letter to John Winthrop (H. C. 1700), December 26, 1720 (4 *Collections*, VIII. 445-446). In the interim Mather had doubtless made collectanea. It is quite possible that some portions of Part One were drawn up (in the form of notes) before 1721; but that would not affect the present argument.

³ In his edition of Thomas's *History of Printing*, II. 390.

in London. 8vo. Boston." Sabin copies this title, changing the date from 1721 to 1714, and appending the remark: "Thomas ¹ says there were two editions, but I have been unable to find either."² Mr. Sibley follows Sabin, quoting his note about the "two editions"; but, though he keeps Sabin's date of 1714, he enters the book among those of 1721, adding that Samuel Mather puts it under that year.³ Nobody professes to have seen the volume,⁴ and both Sabin and Sibley take pains to indicate that they have never set eyes upon it.

Here is a rather pretty bibliographical puzzle. I believe, however, that we can untangle it.

First of all, we must eliminate Sabin's date, 1714. For it was simply impossible for Cotton Mather, before 1721, to write any account whatever of inoculation as practised in London. In April of that year, Lady Mary Wortley Montagu's infant daughter was inoculated by Charles Maitland, a surgeon, and this was the first case of the kind in England, so far as the physicians of the period were aware.⁵ True, the practice was of long standing among the people of Pembrokeshire, in South Wales. Credible evidence from that region carries it back almost to the beginning of the century. One old man, indeed, who died in 1722, declared that inoculation "was used all his Time," and that he well remembered his Mother's telling him that it was a common Practice all her Time, and that she got the Small Pox that way." But these Welsh testimonies were not made public until 1723,⁶ nor have they any pertinency in our present investigation. Whether Sabin's 1714 is a misprint, or whether he was momentarily misled by the fact that the

¹ That is, of course, Dr. Haven.

² *Dictionary of Books relating to America*, xi. 387.

³ *Harvard Graduates*, iii. 134 (No. 356).

⁴ Mr. Charles Evans (*American Bibliography*, i. 297) adds nothing to Haven and Sabin except the erroneous note, "Not given by Sibley."

⁵ Daniel Neal, in his *Historical Introduction*, prefixed to *A Narration of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small Pox in New England* (London, 1722), 5; Douglass, *Dissertation*, 1730, 2-3; cf. Boyer, *Political State* for August, 1721 (xxii. 196) and for March, 1721-2 (xxiii. 336-337); George Harris, *Life of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke*, i. 116-117. Dr. William Black erroneously puts the Wortley Montagu case in 1722 (*Observations Medical and Political on the Small-Pox and Inoculation*, London, 1781, 27).

⁶ See Jurin, *A Letter to the Learned Caleb Cotesworth, M.D.*, London, 1723, 23-31 (also in *Philosophical Transactions*, No. 375, for January-February, 1723, xxxii. 262-269).

letter of Timonius appeared in that year, we cannot tell. Nor is the question of any moment. What is absolutely certain is that 1721 (which stands in Haven) is the earliest conceivable date for any such tract. Again, the statement of Sabin that "Thomas" (*i. e.*, Haven) "says there were two editions," is surely a mistake. Haven makes no such assertion; he merely enters the title under 1721, but offers no further information. Sabin's error, I presume, came from some confusion with an entirely distinct entry in Haven, under this same year, 1721: "Mather, Increase. Some further Account from London of the Small Pox inoculated; with some further Remarks on a late scandalous Pamphlet entitled Inoculation, &c. 2d ed. 16 mo, pp. 8. Boston."¹ At all events, there is no foundation for the

¹ Haven's Thomas, II. 391. This little tract has no title-page. The title is at the head of p. 1: "Some further Account from *London*, of the *Small-Pox Inoculated*. The SECOND EDITION. With some Remarks on a late Scandalous Pamphlet Entituled, Inoculation of the Small Pox as practis'd in Boston, &c. By *Increase Mather, D.D.*" The colophon runs: "BOSTON: Printed for *J. Edwards*, at the Corner Shop on the North-side of the Town-House. 1721." The tract consists of two parts. The first part (pp. 1-4) gives an abstract of Dr. Walter Harris's *De Inoculatione Variolarum*, and is signed "Increase Mather." This abstract of Harris's discourse had already been published (under Increase Mather's signature, and with the date "*Jan. 31. 1721*," *i. e.*, 1722) in *The Boston Gazette* for January 29-February 5, 1722 (No. 115), with the title "Some further Account of the *Small Pox Inoculated*." (See also Cotton Mather's remark in his *Diary*, February 2, 1722, II. 675: "Much good may be done, by making an Extract of Dr. *Harris's* Prælection, *De Inoculatione Variolarum*; and publishing of it here." Cf. Fitz, 323, note 47.) This publication in the *Gazette* on February 5, 1722, was the only *first edition* of the tract. Two days later, on February 7, the abstract was issued as a pamphlet, and to this issue (designated as "THE SECOND EDITION," since it was in fact the *second appearance* of the abstract) were appended "some Remarks" on Douglass's *Inoculation of the Small Pox as practised in Boston*, — an anonymous tract (of which, however, the authorship was well known), issued on January 13, 1722. See Green, *History of Medicine in Massachusetts*, 58-59.

The exact date of the publication of the "second edition" (the *first* in pamphlet form) is ascertained from *The New-England Courant* for February 5-12, 1722 (No. 28), in which this "second Edition" is advertised as "Just Publish'd" and which also contains the following communication from Douglass:

"To Dr. C. M.

Boston, Feb. 10.

SIR

YOUR Remarks &c. in a little Pamphlet published, last Wednesday requires no other Answer but this, Ill language and brutal Manners reflect only on those who are guilty of them.

Yours,

W. D.

Douglass, we observe, ascribed the *Remarks on a late Scandalous Pamphlet* (first appended to Increase Mather's abstract in this so-called "second edition") to Cotton Mather, and retorted accordingly. February 10, 1722, was Saturday;

statement that there were two editions (or that Thomas so asserts) in the case of the tract that we are considering.

Having thus cleared the ground a little, we may take up Mr. Sibley's note to the effect that, in Samuel Mather's list, "An Account of the Method and further Success of Inoculating for the Small Pox in London" is entered under 1721. This observation involves an error which (though venial) is of considerable moment in our problem. *The title, as recorded by Samuel Mather, does not contain the words "in London."* What he gives, as the last of his father's publications for 1721, is simply "An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the *Small-Pox.*"¹ This, then, is the title, and this is the date, which alone rest upon authority, — and the authority is good, too, for Samuel Mather is simply reproducing an entry in Cotton Mather's own manuscript catalogue of his published works.²

There can, then, be no sort of doubt that, before the end of 1721 (*i. e.*, before March 25, 1722), Cotton Mather had written and published a work entitled *An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small-Pox*. The position of the title at the end of Samuel Mather's list for 1721 (which is roughly chronological) tends to prove that the book was written in the latter part of the year.

There is every probability *a priori* that this work dealt with the practice of inoculation *in New England*, and probability is raised to certainty by the following passage in Mather's *Diary* for August 17, 1721:

The Notable Experience I now have of this New Method, for the Saving of many Lives, yea, and for the Abating and preventing of Miseries undergone by many who do live, and survive an horrible Distemper, enables me to recommend the matter so, that I hope it may be introduced into the English Nation, and a World of good may be done to the miserable Children of Men. I take the Matter into Consideration.³

"last Wednesday," therefore, was February 7. For further remarks on Increase Mather and his abstract of Harris, see [Douglass,] *The Abuses and Scandals*, 1722, [iv,] 10; [Isaac Greenwood,] *A Friendly Debate*, 1722, 11, 12, 17, 20; [Douglass,] *Postscript to Abuses, &c.*, [1722,] 8. For the day of publication of Douglass's *Inoculation as practised in Boston*, see p. 436, note 3, *supra*.

¹ Samuel Mather, *Life of Cotton Mather*, 1729, 175.

² *Ib.* 160.

³ *Diary*, II. 638.

From this entry it is clear that the book contemplated was to be addressed to an English rather than an American audience; that its aim was to further inoculation in the mother country; and that, if it was ever written at all, it was sent to England for publication. The most obvious person to whom to send it was Jeremiah Dummer, with whom (as we know) Mather was this year in correspondence,¹ and who had recently procured the printing of his *Christian Philosopher*, — Mather's latest publication on the other side of the water.²

We are to look, therefore, for some book that fulfils these conditions. Such a volume exists, and there is a copy in the Surgeon-General's Office at Washington and in the British Museum. The title-page reads as follows: *An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small-Pox, in Boston in New-England. In a Letter from a Gentleman there, to his Friend in London. London: Printed for J. Peele at Lock's-Head in Paternoster Row, M.DCC.XXII.* This printed letter is dated at the end "*Boston in New-England, Sept. 7, 1721,*" — which accords admirably with the date in the *Diary* (August 17, 1721) on which Mather recorded his project. Prefixed is a dedication "To Sir *Hans Sloane*, President. And to the Rest of the College of Physicians." It is signed "JER. DUMMER," and is dated "*Feb. 23, 1721,*" i. e., of course, 1722. Dummer begins with the following significant sentences:

I Receiv'd the following Account of the Method and Success of inoculating the *Small-Pox* in *New-England*, from a Person there, of great Learning and Probity, who desir'd his Name might be conceal'd;³ having no other View, than a charitable Inclination of doing Good to the World. It seemed to him (as I must freely own it does to me) a Matter of great Importance to the Welfare of Mankind; and if you, Gentlemen, shall be in the same Sentiment, I have no doubt, but it will find your Favour and Encouragement.

These words echo what Mather had written in his *Diary* for August 17, — "to recommend the matter so, that I hope it may

¹ *Diary*, July 20, 1721 (II. 632).

² *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, xiv. 98, and note 5.

³ In the copy of this tract in the Surgeon-General's Office, the name "W^m Tumain" is written with a pen, in a contemporary hand, on p. 27, between the words "Your hearty Friend, and Servant" and the "*FINIS.*" No such signature appears in the British Museum copy. It must be either a random shot or an intentional mystification. *Tumoin* appears to be a *vox nihili*.

be introduced into the English Nation, and a World of good may be done to the miserable Children of Men." We may suspect that Dummer is utilizing certain phrases that occurred in a private letter accompanying the document. The manuscript was doubtless sent to England soon after September 7, 1721 (its date), and it may have been brought to Sloane's notice before November 28. For it is a fair conjecture that he refers to it in a letter written to Richard Richardson, M.D., on that day:

Seventy have been inoculated at Boston in New England, whereof two have died, the rest recovered, and concerning this there will be (I am told) an account published very soon, and the objections against this practice will be answered.¹

Sloane was profoundly interested in inoculation,² and perhaps he defrayed the cost of printing.

Nobody who is acquainted with the literary style of Cotton Mather can read this anonymous tract through without being convinced that every word of it is from his pen. General considerations, however, are not the only proofs to which we can appeal. A host of parallel passages may be adduced to establish his authorship.

The tract begins as follows:

A Gentleman well known in the City of *Boston*, had a *Garamantee* Servant, who first gave him an Account, of a Method frequently used in *Africa*, and which had been practis'd on himself, to procure an *easy Small-Pox*, and a perpetual Security of neither *dying* by it, nor being again infected with it.

Afterwards he successively met with a Number of *Africans*; who all, in *their* plain Way, without any Combination, or Correspondence, agreed in *one Story*, viz. that in their Country (where they use to die like *Rotten Sheep*, when the *Small-Pox* gets among them) it is now become a *common Thing* to cut a Place or two in their Skin, sometimes one Place, and sometimes another, and put in a little of the Matter of the *Small-Pox*; after which, they, in a few Days, grow a *little Sick*, and a few *Small-Pox* break out, and by and by they dry away; and that no Body ever dy'd of doing this, nor ever had the *Small-Pox* after it: Which last Point is confirm'd by their constant Attendance on the Sick in our Families, without

¹ Nichols, *Illustrations of Literary History*, I. 278.

² See his paper in the *Philosophical Transactions*, XLIX. 516-520, and cf. Nichols, *Illustrations*, I. 277-279, 280.

receiving the Infection; and, so considerable is the Number of these in our Neighbourhood, that he had as evident Proof of the *Practice, Safety, and Success* of this Operation, as we have that there are *Lions in Africa*.

After this, he heard it affirm'd, That it is no unusual Thing for our Ships on the Coast of *Guinea*, when they ship their Slaves, to find out by Enquiry which of the Slaves have not yet had the *Small-Pox*; and so carry them a-shore, in this Way to give it to them, that the poor Creatures may sell for a better Price; where they are often (inhumanly enough) to be dispos'd of.

Some Years after he had receiv'd his first *African* Informations, he found publish'd in our *Philosophical Transactions*, divers Communications from the *Levant*, which, to our Surprise, agreed with what he had from *Africa*.¹

Who but Cotton Mather is likely to have written this? It is simply a more concise and finished repetition (in the third person, for anonymity's sake, and with some additions) of what he had written to Dr. Woodward on July 12, 1716. I have already quoted that letter,² for another purpose, and have shown that it was utilized by Mather himself in his *Angel of Bethesda*.

Then follows, in the tract which we are examining, an abstract of Timonius and Pylarinus. It agrees, almost word for word, with the abstract (known to be Mather's) that stands in the Boylston pamphlet.³ "After these Communications," our tract continues, "and the Thing *establish'd in the Mouths of two such Witnesses*, we met with some ingenious Travellers, who knew so much of the Matter, as very much to confirm the Ideas we had entertain'd of it."⁴ Compare Mather's letter to Woodward (July 12, 1716), in which, after mentioning "the account" which Woodward "had from Dr Timonius," the writer speaks of the "method" as one "which I perceive also by some in my neighbourhood lately come from thence [*i. e.*, from Constantinople], has been forsome time successfully practised there."

I add a number of parallels between the Boylston pamphlet (already shown to be in the main from Mather's pen) and the tract which we are discussing.

¹ Pp. 1-2.

² P. 422, *supra*.

³ See pp. 428-429, *supra*. The Latin quotations occurring in the abstract in *The Angel of Bethesda*, but omitted in the Boylston pamphlet (see p. 443, note 4, *supra*), are found in our tract.

⁴ P. 7.

Boylston Pamphlet

The Author of these *Abridgments* address'd them unto those, who had the *Originals* in their Hands; and therefore it cannot be thought, that it was not as *Faithful a Report* as he could make of the matter; But it having been insinuated, that there might be a more full and perfect Relation, &c. (p. 10)

We are informed that there is now and then, but very rarely, a little Abscess in some Emunc-tory of the Body:¹ but we have met with no such thing in our Practice, and we think when such did, or may happen, that it was, or may have been from neglect, or want of Skill in the Practitioner: nor have our Patients hitherto had the Boils and other Swellings which are common in the ordinary Small Pox, so much less is the Blood and other Juices corrupt in this, than the ordinary way. Now to form a Cry of the *Plague* on this occasion, as if the Practice would bring the *Plague*: This is so excessively ridiculous, that it is a wonder any People can think, much less, talk so. (pp. 12-13)

They that have hitherto been under the Operation among us, agree in declaring, that they have suffered in a manner *nothing*; and that they would rather undergo it *several times*, than so

Account, etc.

His Address found . . . an *indecent Reception* with our Physicians; all the Return he had, was a Story which they spread about the Town and Country, that he had given an *unfaithful Account* of the Matter to them, tho' they had it in the printed *Philosophical Transactions* before their Eyes to justify it. (p. 9)

Pylarinus had said, *That sometimes an Abscess happen'd in some Emunc-tory of the Body; which yet* (he said) *was a rare Occurrence.* Now, tho' our Gentlemen knew, that this is a Thing which *daily occurs*, among People recovering from the *Small-Pox* in the *ordinary Way*; (and we had never seen any Thing of it in our *incisious Way*) yet they rais'd a horrible Cry of *Raw Head and Bloody-Bones*, that the *Inoculation* of the *Small-Pox* would bring in the *Plague* among us. (p. 14)

None of the *inoculated* Patients have yet had any of those *Boils*, which People, recover'd of the *Small-Pox* in the *ordinary Way*, are commonly vexed withal. (p. 21)

They zealously gave Thanks to God, for leading them into it; and seriously profess'd to their Neighbours, that they had rather suffer the Operation *twice* every

¹ Here, in the Harvard College copy, Dr. T. L. Jennison makes the following manuscript note: — "It is so: & desirable too. It happened to the writer of this note. He was innoculated 5 times, thrice needlessly."

much as once undergo the *Small Pox* as 'tis generally suffered in the common way; tho' they should be sure of surviving it. And some of them (who are very *religious People*) have publish'd to the World, their Thanks to Almighty GOD, for shewing them this way to escape Death and Misery. (p. 13)

The Objection here is, *I make my self Sick, when I am Well.* But I again say, Will any Man decry all *Preventing Physick*, as Unlawful? Why do our Physicians encourage People every *Spring* and *Fall* to take it? Don't People take the *Poison* of a *Vomit* into their very *Stomachs*, to *prevent* a Sickness a thousand times less to be feared, than the *Small Pox*? (p. 19)

It is *Cavilled* (for to say, *Objected*, would be too easy a word for such Impertinence) that this *New Way* comes to us from the *Heathen*, and we *Christians* must not *Learn the Way of the Heathen*. I Enquire, whether our *Hippocrates* were not an *Heathen*? And whether our *Galen* were not an *Heathen*? And whether we have not our *Mithradate* from the *Heathen*? And whether the first Inven-ter of our *Treacle* were not *Nero's* Physician? And whether we have not learnt some of our very Good Medicines from our *Indians*? . . . And, Gentlemen Smokers, I pray, whom did you learn to Smoke of? (p. 21)

Year, than *once* to undergo the *Small Pox*, as it is most *commonly suffer'd*, tho' they should be sure of surviving it. (p. 15)

They plead, That *the Whole have no Need of a Physician*; and that it is not lawful for me to *make myself sick, when I am well*; and bring a *Sickness* on myself; no, tho' it be to *prevent a greater Sickness*. 'Tis to no Purpose to tell them, that they cavil against the Use of all *preventing Physick*; and that they confute themselves as often as they take a *Vomit*, or use a *Blister*; [&c.] (pp. 23-24)

They plead, *That what is now done, is a Thing learnt from the Heathens; and it is not lawful for Christians to learn the Way of the Heathen*. 'Tis to no Purpose to tell them, that *Hippocrates*, and *Galen* were *Heathen*; and that the Gentleman who invented the blundering (but strangely useful) Composition, call'd *Venice-Treacle*, was an *Heathen*, who was Physician to no better a Man than a *Nero*: And from whom is it that we have our *Mithridate*? And how many noble *Specificks* have we *learnt* from our *Indians*? And from whom did they *learn* to smok *Tobacco*; or drink *Tea* and *Coffee*? (p. 24)

Another set of parallels may be brought to bear on the question. Cotton Mather, as everybody knows, was so shocked and outraged by the frenzied opposition to the inoculating experiment that he verily believed Satan had entered into Boston and the citizens were possessed with the devil. This idea comes out repeatedly in his *Diary*. Now the same notion is emphatically stated in the *Account*, and that too in language which closely resembles Mather's most private ejaculations. Take, for example, the following utterance in the printed tract:

I never saw the Devil so *let loose* upon any Occasion. A *lying Spirit* was *gone forth* at such a Rate, that there was no believing any Thing one heard.¹

Compare Mather's *Diary*, August 28, 1721:

This miserable Town, is a dismal Picture and Emblem of *Hell*; *Fire* with *Darkness* filling of it, and a *lying Spirit* reigning there.²

And again, under October 1:

It is a Time, when people are strangely abandoned unto a froward, raging, lying Spirit.³

Reverting to the *Account*, we read:

That which much added to the Misery, was, that the People who made the *loudest Cry*, . . . had a very *Satanic Fury* acting them.

They were like the *possess'd People* in the Gospel, *exceeding fierce*.⁴

And again the author speaks of the Bostonians as "giving all the Signs of a *Satanic Energy* upon them."⁵ So in his *Diary* for July 30, 1721, Mather writes of "the Satanic Fury that is now raging,"⁶ and under date of July 18 he speaks of "the cursed Clamour of a People strangely and fiercely possessed of the Devil,"⁷ alluding to the very text which the author of the *Account* quotes when he says, "They were like the *possess'd People* in the Gospel, *exceeding fierce*."⁸

¹ *Account*, 16.

² II. 641.

³ II. 651.

⁴ *Account*, 17.

⁵ P. 25. *Energy*, of course, is used in the special sense of "demoniacal possession" (cf. *ἐνεργούμενοι*, "energumens," "demoniacs"), — a meaning which has escaped the editors of the *Oxford Dictionary*.

⁶ II. 635.

⁷ II. 632.

⁸ *Matthew*, VIII. 28: "There met him two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs, exceeding fierce." Other pertinent passages in the *Diary* are July 21, 27, 30, August 1, 6, 22, 24 (II. 633, 634, 635, 636, 639).

One more parallel, and I have done with this enumeration, — not because material is exhausted but because it would be absurd to continue. In his *Diary* for July 16, 1721, Mather makes use of a rather impressive figure:

The Destroyer, being enraged at the Proposal of any Thing, that may rescue the Lives of our poor People from him, has taken a strange Possession of the People on this Occasion.¹

This metaphor is repeated by the author of the *Account*:

The View of these Things caus'd some considerate Persons to think, whether the *Angel of Death* promising himself a great *Feast* in this miserable City, *it might not put him that had the Power of Death, that is, the Devil, into a great Rage*, to see coming in among us, a *Method* of rescuing many *Morsels* from him.²

Enough has doubtless been quoted to convince anybody that the *Account* is a product of Mather's pen. But I cannot close this part of the argument without bringing forward one more bit of evidence. On pp. 7-8 of the *Account* occurs the following extraordinary specimen of figurative ætiology:

Were one of an ordinary Capacity (for no better is he that is now writing) willing to try a little how far *Philosophy* might countenance the Matter: One might think, the venomous *Miasms* of the *Small-Pox*, entering into the Body, in the Way of *Inspiration*, are immediately taken into the Blood of the *Lungs*; and, I pray, how many *Pulses* pass, before the very *Heart* is pierc'd with them? And within how many more they are convey'd into all the *Bowels*, is easily apprehended, by all who know any Thing how the *Circulation of the Blood* is carry'd on; at the same Time the *Bowels* themselves are infeebl'd, and their Tone impair'd, by the *Venom* that is thus insinuated. Behold the Enemy at once got into the very *Center* of the Citadel; and the invaded Party must be very strong indeed, if it can struggle with him, and after all entirely expel and conquer him: Whereas the *Miasms* of the *Small-Pox*, being admitted in the Way of *Inoculation*, their Approaches are made only by the *Out-Works* of the *Citadel*, and at a considerable Distance from it. The Enemy, 'tis true, gets in so far, as to make some *Spoil*; even so much as to satisfy him, and leave no *prey* in the Body of the Patient, for him ever afterwards to seize upon; but the *vital Powers* are kept so clear from his Assaults, that they can manage the *Combat* bravely; and tho' not without a *Surrender* of those Humours in

¹ II. 632.

² P. 18.

the *Blood*, which the Invader makes a Seizure on, they oblige him to *march out the same Way he came in*, and are sure of never being troubled with him any more. If the *Vermicular Hypothesis* of the *Small-Pox* be receiv'd with us, (and it be, as many now think, an *animaculated Business*) there is less of *Metaphor* in our Account, than may be at first sight imagin'd.

But to what Purpose is all this *Jargon*?

What New Englander but Cotton Mather can have excogitated this amazing metaphor? However, we need not appeal to general probabilities, for the whole passage may be read, almost word for word and in Mather's own handwriting, in *The Angel of Bethesda* (MS., pp. 140-141). There is but one conceivable explanation for such a coincidence: Cotton Mather, the author of *The Angel of Bethesda*, was likewise the author of the *Account*.

Even if the parallels were the sole evidence for Mather's authorship of the *Account*, the case might now be regarded as proved beyond a reasonable doubt. But they are not the sole evidence. We know, from Samuel Mather's list, that Cotton Mather did publish (either in 1721 or in January-March, 1722) a tract entitled *An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small-Pox*. And we have before us a pamphlet, actually published in 1722 (with a dedication by Jeremiah Dummer dated February 23, 1721[-2]), which bears the title *An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small-Pox in Boston*. In the dedication Dummer avers that he "received" the document "from a Person there [*i. e.*, in New England], of great Learning and Probity." Our parallels, then, have been adduced merely as *evidence of identity*. For this purpose alone were they needed, and for this they are more than sufficient.

And finally, to clinch the matter, we have a further statement by Cotton Mather himself, hitherto unpublished. In an autograph Catalogue of his communications to the Royal Society, which was enclosed in a letter to Dr. James Jurin, the Secretary, written on May 21, 1723, occurs the following conclusive entry:

An Account of the Method & Success of Inoculating the Small-pox. To M^r Dummer.¹

¹ Catalogue of 1723, *Royal Society MS. Letter-Book*, M. 2. 36 (Gay MS., fol. 180). In the Loose Leaf List the article that corresponds in position with this is

This entry requires no commentary. It rounds off the demonstration with all the traditional neatness of a Q. E. D.

Mather's tract — for Mather's we may henceforth call it — appeared, as we have seen, under favorable auspices, — with an introduction by Jeremiah Dummer, who was highly esteemed in England, and with Sir Hans Sloane as its patron. Naturally, it attracted considerable attention in the mother country, which was just then deeply stirred on the subject of inoculation. Daniel Neal, for example, quoted it several times in 1722.¹ But an especially interesting use was made of it, in the same year, by Dr. Samuel Brady.

Dr. Brady was Physician to the Garrison at Portsmouth, England. He was a staunch champion of inoculation,² and tried it on his own children, four in number, on June 16, 1722.³ The success of the experiment confirmed him in his opinion, and accordingly, in 1722, he gave to the press a pamphlet⁴ in

designated as a letter to Dr. Woodward entitled "*Variolæ Triumphatæ: or, The Small-Pox Inoculated.*" Probably this was the title which Mather gave to his manuscript. Dummer, we may infer, made the alteration, and when Mather, in 1723, drew up a Catalogue of his *Curiosa* to send to Jurin, he adopted the title under which the tract had been published in the meantime. That the same paper should be designated as a letter to Dummer in one list and as a letter to Woodward in another, need cause no difficulty. Dummer had before this been a medium of communication between the two (see Woodward's letter to Mather, April 3, 1721: 1 *Proceedings*, XIII. 110-111). Probably Mather requested Dummer to get the book printed if he could; if not, to pass it along to Woodward for the Royal Society. So Mather wrote to his brother Samuel, in 1715, with respect to the work afterwards published, through Dummer's efforts, under the title of *The Christian Philosopher*: "I renew my Request, that you would not lett my *Christian Virtuoso* be lost, but, if you know no better way to make it public Lett it pass thro' Dr. Woodward's hand, into the Repository of the Royal Society" (*Diary*, II. 324). For the further history of this book, see *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XIV. 98, note 5.

It is barely possible, however, that *Variolæ Triumphatæ* in the Loose Leaf List refers to the *Little Treatise* (see p. 440, *supra*). The title of Chapter XX of *The Angel of Bethesda* is "*Variolæ Triumphatæ. The SMALL-POX Encountred*" (see p. 442, *supra*). For a fact that makes against this alternative, see p. 476, note 2, *infra*.

¹ *Historical Introduction*, prefixed to *A Narrative of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small Pox in New England. By Mr. Benj. Colman* [etc.] (London, 1722), 6, and notes on 25, 27.

² Cf. Dr. James Jurin's *Letter to the Learned Caleb Cotesworth, M.D.*, 1723, 5, 23 (also in the *Philosophical Transactions*, No. 374, XXXII. 213-227), and the same writer's *Account of the Success of Inoculating the Small Pox in Great Brittain*, 1724, 10.

³ Brady, p. 31, gives the date as "Saturday, June 16." The day of the week fixes the year as 1722.

⁴ *Some Remarks upon Dr. Wagstaffe's Letter, and Mr. Massey's Sermon against*

defence of the new method, in the form of three letters to a friend, replying to a previous diatribe of Dr. William Wagstaffe,¹ Swift's friend and a famous wit,² and including many weighty arguments and observations.

Wagstaffe credulously accepted the sensational tales reported by Dr. Lawrence Dalhonde to the Boston selectmen, which had been printed in the London newspapers.³ He also "had the perusal of some Letters, which Dr. *Alexander Stuart* has receiv'd from Dr. *William Douglass*, a Physician of the best Credit and Practice at *Boston*," and he appended extracts from them to his pamphlet.⁴ Brady scouted the evidence of Dalhonde. "An obscure *Frenchman*," he calls him, "whose ridiculous Accounts certainly deserve the Contempt of all judicious Persons."⁵ To the pro-inoculation reports from America, on the other hand, he lent a ready ear, since they came from

Inoculating the Small-Pox: with An Account of the Inoculation of several Children; and Some Reasons for the Safety and Security of that Practice. London, 1722. There is a copy in the Surgeon-General's Office at Washington. Brady's first letter is dated July 26, 1722, and his second July 30, 1722; the third is undated, but was obviously written after no long interval. The sermon by the Rev. Edmund Massey which Brady criticises was published in London in 1722, and there is a copy in the Surgeon-General's office and another (lacking the title-page) in the library of the American Antiquarian Society: — *A Sermon against the Dangerous and Sinful Practice of Inoculation. Preached at St. Andrew's, Holborn, on Sunday, July the 8th, 1722.*

¹ *A Letter to Dr. Freind; shewing the Danger and Uncertainty of Inoculating the Small Pox.* London, 1722. Dated at the end, "June 12. 1722."

² Wagstaffe's best-known work is *A Commentary upon the History of Tom Thumb* (2d ed., 1711), a parody of Addison's critique on *Chevy Chase*. He assailed Dr. Woodward in *A Letter from the Facetious D^r Andrew Tripe* (1719), in which he mentions the smallpox (38-40).

³ Dalhonde's deposition is dated July 21, 1721 (sworn to on the 22d). It is printed by Boylston, *An Historical Account of the Small-Pox Inoculated*, London, 1726, pp. 58-61 (2d ed., Boston, 1730, 51-52). Neal, *Historical Account*, '7, informs us of the publication of Dalhonde's stories in "the News Papers here at London." For a curious traditional anecdote of Dalhonde, see Jennison, 236-237.

⁴ The extracts are from letters of December 20, 1721; February 15, 1722; and April 27, 1722. The first of these three letters is that published by Douglass under the title, *Inoculation of the Small Pox as practised in Boston, Consider'd in a Letter to A—S—M.D. & F.R.S. in London* (Boston, 1722). The second is that published under the title, *The Abuses and Scandals of some late Pamphlets Modestly Obviated* (Boston, 1722); but one of Wagstaffe's excerpts (p. 13) is taken from the postscript, which was issued separately (*Postscript to Abuses, &c. Obviated*, [1722]). The third letter has never been printed, so far as I know, except for the substantial portion which Wagstaffe gives.

⁵ Pp. 13-14 (cf. pp. 17-18).

"Men of the greatest Judgment, Learning and Character there,"¹ and he had read Mather's *Account* and Dummer's dedication with interest and approval.²

One detail, however, in Mather's pamphlet was not to Brady's liking. It was the speculative, ætiological paragraph which I have already quoted, — that in which Mather personifies the smallpox as an enemy assailing and storming the citadel of the human body.³ It is, in truth, grotesque enough, if considered from a scientific point of view, and of this Mather himself was fully aware, for he dismisses the subject without ceremony: "But to what purpose is all this *Jargon*? And of what Significancy are most of our *Speculations*?"⁴ Here is Brady's comment on the paragraph:

I come now, according to your Desire, to give you something of a rational Account of the Safety of this Method. You know what wretched Work the Gentleman makes of it, who writes the Letter from *New-England*, published by Mr. *Drummer*; ⁵ tho' otherwise a Man of Learning, and Sense, and aware of the Folly of attempting it: However, let us try.⁶

These animadversions are quoted by Mather's inveterate opponent, Douglass, with scandalous inaccuracy, in his *Dissertation concerning Inoculation* (1730):

What wretched work (says Dr. *Brady*) the *Gentleman* (Dr. C. M.) who writes the Letter to Mr. *Dummer* from *New-England* makes of his accounts.⁷

Here Douglass, we observe, not only omits Brady's compliment to Mather as a "man of learning and sense," but he also garbles and misapplies the quotation in such fashion that it seems to be an adverse criticism on Mather's whole tract, not (as Brady meant it) on a single unimportant paragraph. Douglass was too opinionated to be fair, and he was a good hater.

However, we are not so much concerned with Douglass's perversity as with his parenthesis. Brady was, of course, quite ignorant of the name of "the Gentleman who writes the Letter to Mr. *Drummer*." But Douglass knew it,⁸ and there-

¹ P. 15.

² See pp. 18, 26.

³ P. 454, *supra*.

⁴ *Account*, 8.

⁵ So printed.

⁶ P. 37.

⁷ P. 7.

⁸ The *New-England Courant* for May 14-21, 1722 (No. 42), contains an interesting mention of our tract, in the course of an unsigned article manifestly

fore he inserts the initials, — “Dr. C. M.” With this final confirmation of Mather’s authorship we may drop the subject.

The relations between the *Account* and the *Little Treatise*¹ are very curious, — though perfectly natural when one considers their respective dates. The *Little Treatise* was finished before June 26, 1721. Its composition (that is to say) preceded Mather’s first acquaintance with inoculation as an *operation in progress*. By September 7, however, — the date of the *Account*, — Zabdiel Boylston had inoculated more than thirty persons in Boston and vicinity,² not a single one of whom had died.³ Mather had good reason, therefore, to regard the results as amply justifying the experiment, and he thought it his duty to further the practice not only in America but in the mother country. With this in view, he drew up the *Account* and sent it to Dummer for publication. Of course, he was at liberty to utilize such portions of the *Little Treatise* as seemed pertinent. Accordingly, as anybody may see for himself by comparing the two documents, he embodied in the *Account* a considerable amount of material that already stood in the *Little Treatise*, often copying word for word. Nearly the whole of the first eight pages of the *Account* consists of such repeated material, — including an abstract of Timonius and Pylarinus.⁴

from Douglass’s pen: — “A Letter from Boston, bearing date the 7th Sept. last, was published in London last February; it was advertis’d in the News Papers thus, ‘An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small Pox upon great Numbers of People (who all recovered) in New-England.’ This Pamphlet, and its Dedication by Mr. Jer. Dummer, shall be considered at large in some subsequent Paper.” I find nothing further on this matter in the file of the *Courant*.

¹ See pp. 440 ff., *supra*.

² Including September 7, the exact number was 35, as may be made out from Boylston’s *Historical Account*.

³ The first inoculated person to die was Mrs. Dixwell. She was inoculated on August 30, 1721, and on September 12 Boylston was still “in good Hopes of her doing well.” Her death did not occur until the 24th. (Boylston, *Historical Account*, 2d ed., 1730, 9-10).

⁴ Either Mather had sent the *Little Treatise* to London (see p. 441, above), or he had not. If he had not, it lay in his desk as ms., and he could properly make extracts from it in composing the *Account*. If he had sent it to London, he did not know whether or not it had been published. The chances were in the negative. But, even if it *had* been published, the scope of the two documents was so different that a certain amount of repetition would make neither of them superfluous. The *Account* did not cancel the *Treatise*.

IV. A FAITHFUL ACCOUNT. 1721.

On October 30, 1721, there was printed in the *Boston Gazette* (No. 101) an anonymous article entitled: "A Faithful Account of what has occur'd under the late Experiments of the *Small-Pox* managed and governed in the way of *Inoculation*. Published, partly to put a stop unto that unaccountable way of Lying, which fills the Town & Country on this occasion; and partly for the Information & Satisfaction of our Friends in other places." The article is well characterized by Dr. Fitz as "a report of progress." It may also be regarded as a kind of supplement to the Boylston tract, which had come out between August 25 and September 24.¹

Dr. Fitz ascribes the *Faithful Account* to Zabdiel Boylston.² No doubt Boylston furnished the author with material, but the man who actually wrote the article was beyond question Cotton Mather. The style is unmistakably his, not Boylston's. Here is a decisive specimen:

Some, of whom the People have confidently affirmed, *That they died under the Inoculation*, have sent their dying Charges unto their Friends, *To hasten into it*. These Friends have done it; and so found their Account in it, and seen such *Easy Circumstances*, that the surviving Relatives of the Deceased are drowned in Tears, to think, how the *Lives of Theirs* ³ have been thrown away.

Mather's authorship of the *Faithful Account* was apparently an open secret in his own day. In the *New-England Courant* of December 4, 1721,⁴ a correspondent, signing himself "Peter Hakins," describes it as "a Piece concerning Inoculation, wherein the Reverend Author publishes to the World what an abundance of Lying and false Reports have been spread."

V. THE WAY OF PROCEEDING AND A FURTHER ACCOUNT.

The sixth paper in the *Philosophical Transactions* for January-March, 1722 (No. 370) is entitled, "*The Way of Proceeding*

¹ See p. 429, note 1, *supra*. ² Fitz, 321. ³ A Latinism (*suorum*).

⁴ No. 18. James Franklin, in this number, defends himself for having published "an Answer to a Piece in the *Gazette* of October 30," and, as a part of his case, reprints that "Answer," namely, the Hakins letter, which had already appeared in the *Courant*. It is not in No. 17 (November 20-27). Nos. 1-16 are not known to exist; but the first publication of the Hakins letter must have taken place not later than November 20.

in the Small Pox inoculated in New England. *Communicated by Henry Newman, Esq; of the Middle Temple.*"¹ This was the Henry Newman (born in 1670) who graduated at Harvard College in 1687 and was librarian there from 1690 to 1693, but who afterwards removed to London, where he became agent for the College and for the Province of New Hampshire. He was also Secretary of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.² Mr. Sibley supposed Newman to be the author of the article just mentioned,³ and it is ascribed to him in Maty's *Index*.⁴

The ascription is certainly erroneous. In the first place, the paper is designated in the *Transactions*, not as *written* by Newman, but as *communicated* by him, a formula especially used when a letter or essay was handed in or read by some person other than the author. Thus the epistle of Timonius was "communicated to the Royal Society by John Woodward";⁵ and Paul Dudley's observations on Maple Sugar, the Moose, and the "Poyson Wood Tree" are labelled as "by the Honourable Paul Dudley, Esq; F.R.S. Communicated by John Chamberlayne, Esq."⁶ Again, the very language of *The Way of Proceeding* shows that the writer lived in New England, and that he was personally acquainted with every detail of the practice of inoculation there. Further, we have the direct testimony of Dr. William Douglass (in his *Dissertation*, 1730) that the author was Cotton Mather. Douglass writes:

The best of Men have some *Foible*: that of Dr. Mathers was *Credulity*; it was upon his Authority that our *New-England Inoculation* was carried on. I shall mention a few Instances of this *weakness* from his own *Letters* concerning Inoculation published in *London*: in one Letter Dated *March 1722* He tells the world, That *A. 1721. in Boston*, some *Cats* had a regular Small-Pox and died of it; that during the Small Pox, the Pigeons and Dunghill Fowls

¹ XXXII. 33-35. No. 370 was "printed . . . 1722" according to the colophon.

² *Harvard Graduates*, III. 389-394; Andrews and Davenport, *Guide to the Manuscript Materials*, 1908, 67, 404.

³ III. 394.

⁴ P. H. Maty, *A General Index to the Philosophical Transactions, from the First to the end of the Seventieth Volume*, 1787, 721.

⁵ *Philosophical Transactions*, No. 339 (XXIX. 72).

⁶ Nos. 364, 367, 368 (XXXI. 27, 145, 165). The word "communicated" is, however, not decisive (see, for example, XXIX. 52, 314, 326, 329).

did not lay nor hatch, *that he never knew Blistering miss of saving life in the Small-Pox, &c.* In his Letter communicated to the R. S. by Mr. Newman in favour of Inoculation he says, *the Patient is more healthy after Inoculation, it is usefull to Women in Child-bed, it dries up tedious running Ulcers, makes the crazy consumptive people hearty, and rids people of their former maladies.* Thus he makes a *Panacea* of it.¹

To Mather's letter of March, 1722, which Douglass mentions first, we shall return in due season.² What concerns us now is, of course, the latter part of Douglass's paragraph, containing quotations from "his [Mather's] Letter communicated to the R. S. by Mr. Newman." Douglass, as Dr. Green reminds me, had the reputation of being "always positive and sometimes accurate." This time he was accurate enough for all practical purposes. The sentences that he quotes occur, almost word for word, in the article communicated by Newman.³

Let us now turn to Mather's *Diary*. On November 24, 1721, he notes:

I draw up the Method of Proceeding in the Inoculation of the *Small-Pox*, and communicate Copies of it, that so Physicians about the Countrey may know how to manage it.⁴

And on December 1, he remarks:

¹ *A Dissertation concerning Inoculation of the Small-Pox* (Boston, 1730), 8. The author's name does not occur on the title-page, but the dedication (to John Jekyll) is signed "W. D.," and there has never been any doubt that Douglass wrote the pamphlet. He repeated considerable passages from it in his *Summary* (an acknowledged work), where the passage just quoted appears in the following shape: — "Dr. C. Mather, who first set up Inoculation in *Boston*, in his published Accounts of it, shows what small Dependance there is upon weak Authorities, 'some Cats 1721 in *Boston* had a regular *Small-Pox* and died of it.' — During the *Small-Pox*, the Pigeons and Dunghill Fowls did not lay nor hatch. — He never knew Blistering miss of saving Life in the *Small-Pox*. — The Patient is more healthy after Inoculation, it is useful to Women in Child-bed, — it dries up tedious running Ulcers, — makes the Crazy Consumptive People hearty, — and rids People of their former Maladies" (II. 411, 1751).

² See pp. 475 ff., *infra*.

³ "The Patient gets abroad quickly, and is most sensibly *Stronger*, and in better Health than he was before. The Transplantation has been given to *Women in Child-bed*, Eight or Nine Days after their Delivery; and they have got earlier out of their Child-bed, and in better Circumstances, than ever in their Lives. Those that have had ugly *Ulcers* long running upon them, have had them healed on, and by this *Transplantation*. Some very feeble, crazy, *Consumptive* People, have upon this *Transplantation*, grown hearty and got rid of their former Maladies" (*Philosophical Transactions*, No. 370, XXXII. 35).

⁴ *Diary*, II. 660.

Having drawn up, the Way of Proceeding, in the *Inoculation* of the *Small-pox*, I communicate Copies of it unto the Physicians and others, in several Parts of the Countrey; that so they may be directed in the Practice of it, as there may be Occasion for it.¹

Both entries manifestly concern one and the same document, and its title (*The Way of Proceeding in the Inoculation of the Small-Pox*) agrees almost exactly with that of the Newman paper (*The Way of Proceeding in the Small Pox Inoculated*). Further, the Newman paper consists of brief and precise directions and practical remarks. In other words, it corresponds to a hair with the paper described in the *Diary*.

We may now take it as proved that the Newman paper is Mather's, and that it is identical, to all intents and purposes, with the document which Mather mentions in his *Diary* for November 24 and December 1, 1721. Besides furnishing copies to the New England physicians, Mather had, it seems, sent a transcript to Henry Newman, who straightway communicated it, at Mather's request, to the Royal Society.²

But we are not yet at the end of our case. Between the entries of November 24 and December 1 (just quoted from Mather's *Diary*) stands another, of much interest, under date of November 30:

Writing Letters for *Europe*, I send over many Things, that I hope, will serve the Kingdome of GOD. And particularly, among the rest, I write a further and a more distinct Account of the *Small-Pox Inoculated*, the Method and Success of it among us, and the Opposition to it; By which Means, I hope, some hundreds of thousands of Lives, may in a little while come to be preserved.³

There can be little doubt that the "many things" here recorded as sent over to Europe, included letters to the Royal

¹ II. 662.

² An unpublished letter from Mather to Newman, September 7, 1719 (Rawlinson ms. C. 743, fol. 53), indicates that their "Old Acquaintance" had at that time been recently "renewed." On February 17, 1720, Mather wrote to Newman (the original draught is in the possession of the American Antiquarian Society), enclosing a series of *Curiosa* for the Royal Society, which he asked Newman to transmit to John Chamberlayne. The series consisted of twelve letters, all of which appear to be lost, though their receipt was acknowledged by Chamberlayne in a letter of August 31, 1720 (see *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XIV. 94, 105, note 8).

³ *Diary*, II. 661-662.

Society, to whom Mather had been despatching *Curiosa Americana*, at intervals, ever since 1712.¹ It is, therefore, with some satisfaction that we discover — both in Mather's Catalogue of contributions drawn up in 1723 and in the Loose Leaf List of "Curiosa Continued" — the title, "A Further Account, of the Small-Pox Inoculated," or (as the Loose Leaf has it) "A further Account, of, the Method & Success of the Small-Pox inoculated." Here then is close agreement with the *Diary* for November 30 (just quoted), so that we may safely infer that the passage in the *Diary* refers to the letter to the Royal Society entered in Mather's two lists.

But what has all this to do with *The Way of Proceeding* sent to the country physicians in Massachusetts and also (as we have discovered) communicated by Newman to the *Philosophical Transactions*? That there is some connection between this document and *A Further Account* is at once suggested by the fact that Mather was at work on both papers at the same time.² What is the connection?

The question is answered by a glance at the chapter on Smallpox in *The Angel of Bethesda*.

This chapter (xx) we have already studied.³ It falls, as we have observed, into two parts (pp. 112-141 and pp. 142-147), and Part One has been shown to coincide with the *Little Treatise* described in the *Diary* for June 22, 1721. Part One comes to an end not far from the middle of MS. p. 141, and contains the sum and substance of what Mather knew about smallpox and inoculation up to June 22, 1721, — four days before the experiment was actually tried in Boston. Let us now scrutinize Part Two (pp. 142-147).

Part Two begins thus:

I am now able as an *Eyewitness*, (& more than so) to give a more full Account of the *Practice*, which until *Now* I could only propose as a Matter at a greater Distance.

There follows a brief but lively narrative of the outbreak of the disease in 1721, of Mather's urging the physicians to con-

¹ See *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XIV. 101-102.

² As is shown by the dates in the *Diary*, — November 24 and December 1, 1721, for *The Way of Proceeding*, and November 30 for *A Further Account* (II. 660, 661-662).

³ See p. 442, *supra*.

sider inoculation, of their distrust of the strange practice, of Boylston's courage in undertaking it, of the frantic opposition of the townspeople, and of the throwing of a "fir'd Granado" through Mather's window. The narrative fills p. 142 of the manuscript and most of p. 143. Next comes (near the bottom of p. 143) the sentence: "I shall now communicate o^r *Way of Proceeding*, in the Practice." And then we encounter (on pp. 143-145) *the full text of The Way of Proceeding, word for word (but for a few slight variations) as it stands in the paper communicated by Henry Newman to the Royal Society*. After this a few sentences bring Chapter XX to a close.¹

This state of things establishes beyond cavil what, indeed, has already been sufficiently demonstrated, — namely, that Mather, not Newman, was the author of *The Way of Proceeding*. But it also shows something else. It shows that, just as Part One of Chapter XX (pp. 112-141) consists of Mather's *Little Treatise* (described in the *Diary* for June 22, 1721), so Part Two consists of the essay that he describes in the *Diary* for November 30, — "a further and a more distinct Account of the *Small-Pox Inoculated*, the Method and Success of it among us, and the Opposition to it." And this paper, as we know, is included in Mather's own Catalogue of his Communications to the Royal Society and in the Loose Leaf List. We observe also that this *Further Account* included *The Way of Proceeding*, — the document which Mather distributed among the New England physicians.

What Newman received from Mather, then, was, in all probability, the *Further Account*, consisting of (1) the narrative and (2) the practical observations (*The Way of Proceeding*). In communicating the material to the Society, however, he omitted the narrative portion (which was of less immediate interest to the English savants), and confined himself to the practical observations.² Thus it happens that the paper, as printed in the *Transactions*, opens with marked abruptness.

Mather himself refers to this paper in an unpublished letter to Jurin, May 4, 1723:

¹ The Newman paper consists of thirteen numbered sections. These few additional sentences make a fourteenth in *The Angel of Bethesda*.

² Or, as is perhaps equally probable, Newman communicated the whole of the *Further Account*, and the editor of the *Transactions* deleted the introductory (narrative) portion.

We had but One Physician in the City, who ventured on y^e Practice; whose Courage, with y^e Blessing of God upon his Endeavours, triumphed over the Attempts of his Adversaries to ruine him. His *Method*, you have already received and imparted.¹

Here, as always, he is frank and generous in his praise of Zabdiel Boylston. The method (or "way of proceeding") which Mather had described in his *Further Account*, and which had been printed in the *Philosophical Transactions*, was, of course, that followed by Boylston, who had improved upon the Oriental practice in several respects.²

Why Mather called his essay *A Further Account of the Method and Success of the Small-Pox Inoculated* must now be perfectly clear. It was with reference to the title of his previous tract (the Letter to Dummer), — *An Account of the Method and Success of Inoculating the Small-Pox in New-England*. We can also understand why the introductory narrative in the *Further Account* is so short. It was intended to supplement what had already been told in the Dummer tract. This function it does in fact fulfil. The most exciting occurrence between September 7 (the date of the letter to Dummer) and November 30 was the incident of the *hand-grenade*, — an outrage which, as we have seen, is duly emphasized in the *Further Account*.

For convenience, and in lieu of other summary, I subjoin an analysis of Chapter XX of *The Angel of Bethesda*.

PART ONE (MS., pp. 112-141). Practically identical with the *Little Treatise* described in Mather's *Diary*, June 22, 1721 (II. 627-628). The three sections of this *Treatise* appear in *The Angel of Bethesda* as follows:

- (1) "Sentiments of piety" (pp. 112-119).
- (2) "Best medicines and methods" (pp. 120-132).
 - (a) Sydenham (pp. 120-126).
 - (b) Woodman (pp. 127-128).
 - (c) Pitcairn (pp. 128-129).
 - (d) "Mantissa": Woodward's method (pp. 130-132). On an inserted sheet of smaller size. Perhaps not a part of the *Little Treatise*. P. 133 contains transitional sentences leading up to (3).

¹ From the original draught, p. 16 (A. A. S.).

² See Boylston, *Historical Account*, 2d ed., 1730, 6, 42 ff.; [Mather,] *An Account of the Method and Success* (the Dummer tract), 1722, 19-20.

- (3) Inoculation (headed "Appendix") (pp. 134-141). This section is an adaptation of the *Address to the Physicians* (July 6, 1721). It consists of —
- (a) Introduction (p. 134), containing (1) the story of Onesimus (as in the letter of July 12, 1716, and in the Dummer tract, 1); (2) other African testimony (practically identical with a passage in the Boylston tract, 1721, p. 9, and agreeing closely with Dummer tract, 1-2).
 - (b) Abstract of Timonius and Pylarinus (pp. 135-140), corresponding almost word for word with that given (from the *Address to the Physicians*) in Boylston tract, 1-8, and with that in the Dummer tract, 2-7.
 - (c) Ætiological speculation (pp. 140-141), corresponding closely with Dummer tract, 7-8.
 - (d) Peroration (p. 141), ending "I have done." Adapted from the peroration of the *Address to the Physicians* (as quoted in *A Vindication of the Ministers*, 1722, 7-8, and in [Greenwood's] *Friendly Debate*, 1722, 5-6). In the ms. the peroration is cancelled, and a couple of sentences are substituted in the margin.

PART TWO (MS., pp. 142-147). Practically identical with "a further and a more distinct Account of the *Small-Pox Inoculated*, the Method and Success of it among us, and the Opposition to it," mentioned in the Diary, November 30, 1721 (II. 661-662), as sent to Europe. This is the same thing entered in Mather's Catalogue of 1723 as "A Further Account of the Small-pox Inoculated," and in the Loose Leaf List as "A further Account, of, the Method & Success of the Small-Pox Inoculated."

- (1) Brief sketch of inoculation in Boston to November 30, 1721, including the incident of the *granado* (pp. 142-143).
- (2) "The way of proceeding" (pp. 143-147), almost exactly coincident with "The way of proceeding" communicated by Henry Newman to the Royal Society (*Philosophical Transactions*, xxxii. 33-35). This section is doubtless practically identical with the document mentioned in the *Diary*, November 24 and December 1, 1721 (II. 660, 662).

VI. MISCELLANEOUS CURIOSA OF 1721.

The *Further Account*, as we have seen, was sent to London, in all likelihood, about November 30, 1721, as one of a considerable number of *Curiosa Americana* addressed to Dr. Woodward.

The titles of the other papers in the packet are recoverable from Mather's two lists.¹ They were as follows:

Nishmath-Chajim. The probable seat & general cure of all Diseases.

The Seventh Son Examined. With a Touch upon the Kings Evil.

Lacus Mirabilis.

An Horrible Tempest.

Ostreophagi or a Matchless Oister-Hill.

Absinthium sempervivum.

Ambergrise discovered & determined.

Nævi Materni.

Melissologia; with a new Method of Bee-hunting.

These, with the *Further Account*, make a series of *ten letters*, — a very probable number, since Mather was fond of decades.

Most of the letters in this particular Decade of *Curiosa* seem to have perished. *Ostreophagi* doubtless described some great Indian shell-heap, possibly the famous deposits at Damariscotta, Maine. *Melissologia* unquestionably treated of the subject that Paul Dudley handles in a brief paper (entitled *An Account of a Method lately found out in New-England for Discovering where the Bees Hive in the Woods, in order to get their Honey*) printed in the *Philosophical Transactions* for January–April, 1721.² Dudley's article, however, contains none of that out-of-the-way lore in which Mather's presumably abounded.

Ambergrise discovered & determined, another lost paper of the Decade, I should like to retrieve, if only for the pleasure of comparing it with one of the most ambitious of Dudley's communications to the Royal Society: *An Essay upon the Natural History of Whales, with a particular Account of the Ambergris found in the Sperma Ceti Whale*. This appeared in the *Philosophical Transactions* for March–April, 1725.³ Cotton Mather was not the only New Englander who sent odd stories to England. Dudley spins a yarn about a finback that "came into an Harbour near *Cape-Cod*, and tow'd away a Sloop of near forty Tun, out of the Harbour into the Sea." I believe the yarn, for it is credible enough, and besides, who could resist the authorities who helped Dudley to collect his material, —

¹ The Catalogue of 1723 and the Loose Leaf List.

² No. 367 (XXXI. 148–150).

³ No. 387 (XXXIII. 256–269).

"the Reverend Mr. Greenleaf¹ of Yarmouth, near Cape-Cod, and Mr. J. Coffin, sometime of the Island of Nantucket, both of them Places famous for the Whale-Fishery." It was Nathaniel Coffin who supplied Cotton Mather with his first knowledge of the famous Amphisbæna of Newbury,²—but the Coffins were a large family.

Two papers mentioned in the list, however, besides the *Further Account* are preserved. One, *Nishmath-Chajim*,³ is well known. It was composed for *The Angel of Bethesda*, and stands as Chapter v. in the manuscript; but it was also published as a tract in 1722 or 1723.⁴ The other is *The Seventh*

¹ The Rev. Daniel Greenleaf (H. C. 1699) was minister of the First Church at Yarmouth, Massachusetts, from 1708 to 1727 (see Freeman, *History of Cape Cod*, II. 208-10, 212, 214, 594, 697-8; J. W. Dodge, *History of the First Congregational Church, Yarmouth*, 1873, 21-25; C. F. Swift, *Old Yarmouth*, 121-123, 139). I have a receipt, in Mr. Greenleaf's handwriting, which runs as follows: "Rec^d of M^r John Miller Const^{ble} the full of my Sallery for my 14th years service in the work of y^e Ministry being y^e year of our Lord 1721 I say rec^d Dan^l Greenleaf."

² Coffin's letter, June 14, 1723, concerning this two-headed monster, published in the *New-England Courant*, No. 100 (for June 24-July 1), is reprinted by J. T. Buckingham, *Specimens of Newspaper Literature*, 1850, I. 85. See Mather's letter to Jurin, September 21, 1724 (*Royal Society Letter-Book*, M. 2. 47; Gay MS., fols. 219-222).

³ I. e., Breath of Life (*Genesis*, ii. 7).

⁴ Sihley, No. 371 (III. 138). "New-London. Printed and Sold by Timothy Green, 1722." The title-page reads, *The Angel of Bethesda*, but the running title is *Nishmath-Chajim* [etc.].

Mather sketched the plan of *The Angel of Bethesda* in a letter to John Winthrop (H. C. 1700), December 26, 1720. He refrained from enclosing "a sheet or two of my MSS" because of the risks of conveyance (4 *Collections*, VIII. 445-446). On April 17, 1721, he reports slow progress, and adds: "I here single out one chapter of it, for your present Entertainment; Because I thought the Curiosity with the Novelty of it, would be really Entertaining to a Gentleman of your Sagacity" (*Ib.* 448). That this chapter was the *Nishmath-Chajim* may be inferred, partly from the quality of that tract (which suits the description), and partly from another letter to Winthrop, April 23, 1722: "I was looking out something to treat you withal; and, Lo, as a Fore-runner to some other Things, I single out a Chapter, in THE ANGEL OF BETHESDA; which, I pray, lett Return by a safe Conveyance within a Month; with your sentiments upon my NISHMATH CHAJIM, which you always know my value for" (*Ib.* 452). The new chapter, sent with this letter, was probably the *Seventh Son*, to which Mather refers (as perhaps in Winthrop's hands) in a letter of January 10, 1723: "Did I ever send you a Little Dissertation of mine, upon, *A Seventh Son*? A passage in one of your Letters, Looks as if I did; tho' I don't remember, that ever I did it" (*Ib.* 454). And finally, still in 1723 (apparently in May or early June), Mather writes to Winthrop: "I must importunately Request, That my Two Manuscripts; The *Nishmath-Chajim*, and *The Seventh Son*, may . . . be return'd unto me. I have no copy of them, and I have more than ordinary occasion for them" (*Ib.* 454). The urgent occasion was, no doubt, Mather's wish to insert these chapters in their

Son. This, too, is preserved (as I believe) in *The Angel of Bethesda*. It has a curious history, which seems hitherto to have escaped the antiquarian investigator.

On November 23, 1721, there appeared at Boston a single folio sheet ¹ consisting of two parts: (1) *Several Reasons proving that Inoculating or Transplanting the Small Pox, is a Lawful*

proper places in the work, which was approaching completion. The whole manuscript was ready for the printer on February 20, 1724 (*Diary*, II. 608).

From all this it appears that the *Nishmath-Chajim* was finished before April 17, 1721, — in ample time, therefore, to be sent to England with other *Curiosa* on or about November 30, 1721 (cf. *Diary*, II. 661-662). Further, since Mather asked for the return of the manuscript in the spring of 1723, and said nothing about its having been printed at New London, I suspect that the 1722 on the title-page stands for 1722-3, and that the tract appeared between January 1 and March 25 of that year. Samuel Mather's list (p. 175) puts it third from the end under 1722.

The letter asking the return of the *Nishmath-Chajim* and the *Seventh Son* is undated, but was obviously written later than that of January 10, 1722-3. A hither limit may be determined from the contents. (1) Mather asks for an account of a certain "New Snake, who commands & governs the Rattle-Snakes." Now on June 4, 1723, he wrote to the Royal Society on that subject (to Jurin, *Royal Society Letter-Book*, M. 2. 38; Gay ms., fol. 187; draught in A. A. S.). (2) Mather remarks that "the New Uproar, which keeps the King at home, & keeps the Camp at Hide Park still going on, is variously talk'd about." This reference to Atterbury's Plot and its consequences can hardly have been written after July 8, 1723, when the *New-England Courant* printed news from London (dated May 7) to the effect that "his Majesty designs to go to Hanover about the Beginning of next Month." His visit for 1722 had been omitted on account of the plot. (See Robert Walpole's letter of May 29, 1722 O. S., to Horace Walpole in Coxe, *Walpole*, II. 220; Boyer, *Political State* for May, 1722, XXIII. 531, 549; *New England Courant*, August 6, 1722, No. 53; July 8, 1723, No. 101; July 22, 29, Nos. 103-104; Swift to Robert Cope, June 1, 1723, Scott's Swift, 2d ed., XVI. 414). (3) Mather says, "Our New Scene of Troubles here, God knows when & how it will terminate." This manifestly alludes to the incendiary fires and the fear of a servile insurrection in Boston in the spring of 1723 (*Courant*, April 22, 29, May 13, July 8, 1723, Nos. 90, 91, 93, 101; Mather to Prince, *Diary*, II. 686-688.) — We may feel quite safe, then, in dating this letter sometime between May 1 and June 4, 1723. As printed in 4 *Collections*, VIII. 454-455, the letter is unfortunately run together with the last page (all that is preserved) of a letter dated "12^d 1^m. 1722, with which (as a glance at the original manuscripts among the Winthrop Papers reveals) it has nothing to do. The dividing line should come on printed page 455 between the words "into the common" and "And what?" The letter of "12^d 1^m 1722" enclosed a copy of [Greenwood's] *Friendly Debate* — a circumstance which makes it clear that "1722" is N. S., not, as the editors assume, 1722-3 (see p. 472, note 5, *infra*).

¹ So described by Dr. Haven in his edition of Thomas, II. 391. I know of nobody who has seen the original. It is reprinted in 1 *Collections*, IX. 275-280 (as Mr. Ford notes in the *Diary*, II. 660), but nothing is there said of the form or whereabouts of the thing itself. It was, I suppose, not a broadside, but a leaf printed on both sides.

Practice, by Increase Mather;¹ and (2) *Sentiments on the Small Pox Inoculated*. The second piece is unsigned,² but it is at once recognizable as Cotton Mather's, was probably never disowned by him, and is proved to be his work by an entry in the *Diary*.³

A reply to both parts was speedily prepared by John Williams.⁴ It came out, in all probability, on December 4, 1721.⁵ Williams kept a "tobacco cellar" in Boston⁶ and very likely dispensed drugs as well. Indeed, he seems to have given medical advice to his customers gratis.⁷ He was an unlettered man,

¹ The *Several Reasons* is expressly designated as "by Increase Mather," and is dated November 20, 1721.

² Increase Mather introduces it as "the sentiments of another, well known in our churches, of which I declare my hearty approbation."

³ November 23, 1721: "I join with my aged Father, in publishing some, SENTIMENTS ON THE SMALL-POX INOCULATED" (II. 660). The exact date of issue may be inferred from this entry. Its limits are fixed (1) by the date appended to Increase Mather's contribution, November 20, 1721, and (2) by a reply to the *Sentiments*, in the *Courant* for November 20-27 (No. 17).

⁴ *Several Arguments, proving, That Inoculating the Small Pox is not contained in the Law of Physick, either Natural or Divine, and therefore Unlawful. Together with A Reply to two short Pieces, one by the Rev. Dr. Increase Mather, and another by an Anonymous Author, Intituled, Sentiments on the Small Pox Inoculated. And also, A Short Answer to a late Letter in the New-England Courant. By John Williams. Boston: Printed and sold by J. Franklin . . . 1721.*

⁵ There is contradiction in the announcement of this tract in Franklin's own newspaper, the *Courant*. In No. 18 (for November 27-December 4, 1721) "the Second Edition" is advertised as "Just Publish'd," but in No. 19 (for December 4-11) the same thing (without the words "Second Edition") is advertised as "This Day publish'd." I have compared a copy of the tract which professes to be of "The Second Edition" (Harvard College Library) with two copies which do not so designate themselves (M. H. S., A. A. S.), and the contents are identical. So (with a few slight variations) are the typography and make-up. It is manifest that the type was not reset, except perhaps for the last page. A few trifling corrections are made in the "Second Edition." It is possible that the first edition came out between November 23 (when the two "pieces" by the Mathers appeared) and December 4, and the second edition on December 11.

A scurrilous reply to Williams, in prose and verse (dated "Cambridge. Dec. 19. 1721") was sent to the *Courant*, and was printed at the end of *A Friendly Debate; or, A Dialogue between Rusticus and Academicus* (Boston. Printed and Sold by J. Franklin, 1722), 8-11, where it is ascribed to "an Academical Brother (Son to a Fellow of the Royal Society)," i. e., of course, to Samuel Mather. He expressly declared, however, in the *Courant*, No. 33 (for March 12-19, 1722), that he "was not concern'd in writing or composing" it.

⁶ See [Isaac Greenwood,] *A Friendly Debate; or, A Dialogue between Academicus; and Sawny & Mundungus* (Boston, 1722), 20-21, 22-24; *A Friendly Debate; or, A Dialogue between Rusticus and Academicus* (Boston, 1722), 7-12; *A Vindication of the Ministers of Boston* (Boston, 1722), 3; John Williams, *An Answer to a Late Pamphlet* (Boston, 1722), 14-15.

⁷ In his *Answer to a Late Pamphlet*, p. 15, Williams says: "Unless I could install

whose eccentric spelling made him the butt of numerous witticisms. He was dubbed *Mundungus*, from his trade,¹ and it was pretended that he had invented a new variety of human speech, *Mundungian*, which was well-fitted to be "the Universal Language." It was facetiously proposed that he be appointed Professor of Mundungian at Harvard College. A Mundungian Vocabulary was printed, enshrining such gems as *cidnys* for "kidneys," *deses* for "disease," *fecicions* for "physicians," and *yers* for "ears."² Even Williams's publisher, James Franklin, lent himself to the jest,³ and inserted in the *Courant*, without correcting the blunders in orthography, two letters from him (one of them signed "J. W.") as specimens of the Mundungian Language.⁴ If they are authentic (as they doubtless are), John Williams was a spelling reformer of the heroic school afterwards made illustrious by Lord Timothy Dexter. Mather describes him as follows, in an unpublished letter to Dr. James Jurin, May 4, 1723:

A sorry *Tobacconist*; who could hardly spell a Word of *English*, (even the Word *English*, from his acute Pen was *Engleche*) and could not read his own Manuscript, but pray'd the Printer to find out y^e Meaning, & make English of it. This hideous Fellow, who is more known by the Name of *Mundungus* than that of *John Williams*, directed his Readers, to *studde sempeti* and *Anthepeti*;⁵ and to forbid this *Prates*, because, to *specke for Hoomain Invenecions in Fisecke*, is not *alowebe*.⁶

you with the Title of *Doctor of Physick*, you must expect to follow my Steps, and give Advice *gratis*."

¹ The nickname antedates the publication of [Greenwood's] *Friendly Debate*. A writer in the *Gazette*, January 8-15, 1722 (No. 112), who dates his letter "*Cambridge, January 11. 1721*" (i. e. 1722), calls him "that Crackbrain'd *Mundungus Williams*."

² See [Greenwood's] *Friendly Debate*, 20-23.

³ So did the anonymous author of the *Dialogue between Rusticus and Academicus* (p. 12), though he, like Williams, was opposed to inoculation.

⁴ *New-England Courant*, No. 32 (for March 5-12, 1722). Williams's two tracts (*Several Arguments*, 1721; and *An Answer to a Late Pamphlet*, 1722) are not spelled in Mundungian fashion.

⁵ In his *Several Arguments*, p. 1, Williams declares that "the Rules of Natural Physick are *Two*, and no more; which are *Sympathy* and *Antipathy*." Mather mentions Mundungus in a letter of "12^d 1.^m 1722" to John Winthrop (4 *Collections*, VIII. 455). This, I suspect, is 1722 N. S. (not 1722 [-23] as dated by the editors). For it obviously accompanied a copy of [Greenwood's] *Friendly Debate*, which came out on March 7, 1721-22 (see *Courant*, No. 32, for March 5-12). Cf. p. 469, note 4, *supra*.

⁶ From the original draught (dated May 4, 1723) in the possession of the

Williams's reply to the Mathers' folio sheet is rather dull reading, except for a couple of paragraphs that illustrate the popular superstitions of the time. Cotton Mather, in the *Sentiments*, had appealed to "experience" to show "that there never was a more unfailing remedy [than inoculation] employed among the children of men."¹ Williams saw an opening for a *reductio ad absurdum*. Here is his triumphant rejoinder:

Hold Sir, suppose I tell you of two as successful, to wit, to cure Agues. The first is to wear a Spell about the Neck, next to the Skin; I can tell you too how to make it, and what Words are used in it. *2dly*, The writing the Persons Name that hath the Ague, by the hand of a Seventh Son, and he slitting the Rine of an Elder-Tree, and opening it, and putting the Piece of Paper in, will cure the Ague: And they tell you of much Virtue in the Seventh Son, and also of the Elder Tree; and they, do not say *ask them not*, but tell us the Reason *why they say so*, to wit, because Judas hanged himself on it. I could tell you of many more such Things, with respect to the Event, which are good to a Person or People; but that does not prove it to be lawful, which you should have done, if you understand your Argument.²

A few pages later Williams reverts to the Seventh Son, associating him with the famous cure by the Royal Touch. Cotton Mather had contended that "the parents, and masters, and husbands and wives, whose relatives have beg'd as for their lives, that they might have leave to save their lives, by this method, should not by their obstinate violence hinder them from it, least on the loss of their lives they have sad matter of reflection left unto them."³ Williams retorts:

Sir, I shall answer you by a Similitude, and you may judge. I have known Children that have had the King's Evil, and have desired their Governours let them go and be touched by the King, who lays his Hand upon them, and says, I touch, and God heals: Whether or no if Parents or Governours are satisfy'd that it is not lawful, or that there is no Physical Means in it, they ought not to deter them from it, lest the Disease may not go off, and they have sad Cause of Reflection. The like Cure the Seventh Son performs, which you may consider.⁴

American Antiquarian Society, pp. 14-15. In the same letter Mather calls Williams "this Poor smoaky Conjurer" (p. 15).

¹ *1 Collections*, ix. 278.

² *Several Arguments*, 11.

³ *Sentiments*, etc. (*1 Collections*, ix. 279). ⁴ *Several Arguments*, 16-17.

One may venture to assert, with little fear of contradiction, that in these two inimitable arguments of Mundungus Williams we have latent the impulse that moved Cotton Mather to compose *The Seventh Son Examined; with a Touch upon the Kings Evil*. This title directly follows *Nishmath Chajim* in both lists of *Curiosa*, and there is no difficulty about dates.¹

The *Seventh Son*, at all events, was written and sent to Dr. Woodward with other *Curiosa Americana*. It is preserved, I believe, in Chapter LXII of *The Angel of Bethesda*.

The title of this Chapter is "Fuga Dæmonum. or, Cures by CHARMS considered. And, a SEVENTH SON examined." The first three pages (pp. 374-377) inveigh against the use of charms. Then follows (on pp. 378-380) a section headed "Mantissa," which begins: "We have a Fancy among o^r Common People, That a SEVENTH SON, among Brethren that have not had a Sister born between them, is endued with I know not what, *Power of Healing* Various Distempers, with a Touch of his Hand upon y^e Part affected." P. 381 is blank. P. 382 begins a new section — headed "An Appendix. POPERY ridiculed" — which continues through p. 384 and closes the chapter. It discusses the custom of appealing to special saints for the relief of special diseases, and condemns, as a folly akin to idolatry, the practice (once common in medicine) of "assigning . . . Particular Plants to particular Planets." The whole chapter is instructive reading for such of us moderns as have been brought up to think that Cotton Mather was a type-specimen of the *homo superstitiosus*.

How much of Chapter LXII was contained in the *Seventh Son* that Mather sent to Woodward, we cannot tell; possibly the whole of it, but certainly the "Mantissa" (pp. 378-380), at the very least, and probably the "Appendix" (pp. 382-384)

¹ Williams's *Several Arguments* came out between November 23 and December 4 (or perhaps on the latter date), 1721. Mather was "writing letters for *Europe*" and "sending over many Things" on November 30th (*Diary*, II. 661-662). These may have gone by David Cutler, who is recorded as "entered out" for London in the *News-Letter* for November 27-December 4, 1721 (No. 931). The *Courant* of the same dates (No. 18) says that David Cutler was "outward bound" for London in the ship *Abraham*. Or they may have gone by John Westcot, of the *Friendship*, who "cleared out" in the next week (*News-Letter*, No. 932, for December 4-11, 1721; *Courant*, No. 19, same dates), or by Jonathan Clark, who "cleared out" in the week after (*News-Letter*, No. 933, for December 11-18; *Courant*, No. 20, same dates).

as well. That the "Appendix" was originally addressed to a British audience is proved by a minute detail: Mather speaks of a famous English physician¹ as "your Culpepper."² So much for the *Seventh Son*.

VII. CURIOSA VARIOLARUM. 1722.

Dr. James Jurin, Secretary of the Royal Society, was one of the leading English advocates of inoculation. In a tract on the subject, published in 1723,³ he remarks:

The Reverend Mr. *Mather*, in a Letter dated *March 10, 1721*, from *Boston in New England*, gives an Account, That of near 300 inoculated there, 5 or 6 died upon it or after it, but from other Diseases and Accidents, chiefly from having taken the Infection in the common way by Inspiration, before it could be given them in this way of Transplantation.²

And again, on the same page:

Mr. *Mather* tells us, that the Persons inoculated were *young and old, from 1 Year to 70, weak and strong*; and by other relations we are inform'd, that *Women with Child, and others even in Childbed*, underwent the Operation. Apparently the Greatness of the Danger they were in, from the Infection in the Natural Way, which then raged among them with the utmost Fury, made them the more adventurous.

Once more:

Mr. *Mather* observes, in his Letter mention'd above, that *out of more than 5000 Persons that had the Small Pox at Bos-*

¹ Nicholas Culpeper (1616-1654). See *Dictionary of National Biography*, XIII. 286-287.

² MS., p. 384.

³ *A Letter to the Learned Caleb Cotesworth, M.D. . . . Containing a Comparison between the Mortality of the Natural Small Pox, and that Given by Inoculation*, London, 1723. The letter is dated "Feb. 20th, 1723." There is a postscript beginning: "Since this Paper was drawn up and communicated to the Royal Society, the following Account of the Success of Inoculation in and about *Boston, in New England*, was procured at my Desire, by my Ingenious Friend Dr. *Nesbitt*, from Capt. *John Osborne*, who resided in that Town and Neighbourhood during the whole time of that Practice. I think proper to insert it here, as it confirms Mr. *Mather's* Relation, and is a more particular Account of the Matter of Fact, than any that I have yet seen" (p. 19). Jurin's Letter to Cotesworth, with the Postscript, was also published in No. 374 of the *Philosophical Transactions* (for November-December, 1722, XXXII. 213 ff.).

² P. 6 (*Philosophical Transactions*, XXXII. 215).

ton in New England, within little more than half a Year, near 900 died.¹

Mather's letter is extant, in a contemporary copy, in Sloane MS. 3324, fol. 260. It is dated "March 10. 172 $\frac{1}{2}$," and was addressed to Dr. John Woodward.² The passages quoted by Jurin occur in it. The same letter is also quoted by Dr. William Douglass, in his *Dissertation*, 1730, for the sake of illustrating what he styles Mather's "foible" of "credulity."

The best of Men have some *Foible*: that of Dr. Mathers was *Credulity* . . . I shall mention a few Instances of this *weakness* from his own *Letters* concerning Inoculation published in *London*: in one Letter Dated *March 1722* He tells the world, That *A. 1721. in Boston, some Cats had a regular Small-Pox and died of it; that during the Small Pox, the Pigeons and Dunghill Fowls did not lay nor hatch, that he never knew Blistering miss of saving life in the Small-Pox, &c.*³

Mather's words in the letter of March 10, 1721-2, are as follows:

Your D^r Leigh, in his *naturall History of Lancashire*, counts it an occurrence worth relating, that there where some Catts known to catch the Small Pox, & pass regularly thro' the state of it, & then to Dy, Wee have had among us the very same Occurrence.

It was generally observ'd, & Complain'd, that the *Pidgeon Houses* of the City continued unfruitfull, & the Pidgeons did not Hatch or lay as they used to do, all the while that the *Small Pox* was in its

¹ P. 17 (*Philosophical Transactions*, XXXII. 223).

² The letter begins: "So Considerable a part of Mankind fearfully perishing by the *small Pox* and many more of us grievously Suffering, by that miserable Distemper, You will Allow me to Entertain you, with a few more Communications, and write You (I think its) a fourth Letter upon it" (Sloane MS. 3324, fol. 260 a). The previous letters were clearly enough, (1) that of July 12, 1716, (discussed on pp. 420 ff. *supra*); (2) that of September 7, 1721, printed as *An Account*, etc., in 1722 (see pp. 444 ff., *supra*); and (3) the *Further Account* (see pp. 460, 463 ff., *supra*). Of these the first and third were certainly addressed to Woodward, and the second is so designated in the Loose Leaf List (though labelled "To M^r Dummer" in the Catalogue of 1723; see p. 455, *supra*). We may feel sure, therefore, that this letter of March 10, 1721-2, was also addressed to Woodward (though no address appears in the Sloane MS.), and that it is identical with *Curiosa Variolarum*, mentioned as addressed to him in both the Catalogue of 1723 and the Loose Leaf List.

³ P. 8. Douglass repeats this passage with slight variations, in his *Summary*, II. (1751) 411. In the latter place he omits the date (March, 1722), but still refers to the matter as "published."

Epidemical Progress. And it is very strongly affirm'd, that our Dunghill Fowl, felt much of the like effect upon them.

.

I will add but one thing more. For succour under the *Small Pox*, where Life is in Danger, after all the Methods & Medicines, y^t our *Sydenham* and others rely upon, I can assure you, wee have yet found nothing so sure as this. Procure for the Patient as early as may be, by *Epispasticks* a plentiful Discharge at the Handwrists or Ankles, or both; (I say, *as early as may be*) & keep them running till the danger is over. When the Venom of the *Small Pox* makes an Evident & violent Invasion on the noble parts, this Discharge *does wonderfully*. I am sorry it was so late before wee fell into *this way*; but it has *constantly prospered*; I know not, that it has once Miscarried, since wee came into it.¹

The passages derided by Douglass, we note, form no part of Jurin's quotations. Hence it is clear that Douglass, when he says that Mather's letter was "published in London," cannot be referring to the extracts made by Jurin.² Nobody has yet found Mather's letter in print. Doubtless, however, it saw the light in some London newspaper of the time. We know that the London papers paid more or less attention to the epidemic in Boston and to the experiments there tried in the way of inoculation. For instance, they reproduced Dr. Lawrence Dalhonde's sensational report made to the selectmen on July 21, 1721.³ A search in the files in the British Museum might add several items to our knowledge of the disturbances in Boston.

The title *Curiosa Variolarum* occurs in both the Catalogue of 1723 and the Loose Leaf List, and may unhesitatingly be attached to the letter of March 10, 1721-2.

¹ This passage about epispastics (or blisters) is repeated, almost word for word, in the margin of p. 126 of *The Angel of Bethesda* (Chapter xx), as a later addition to the text.

² In another place in his *Dissertation* (22-23) Douglass remarks: "Dr. Mather in his Letters published in *London*, gives the reason why they used no precaution: because in the natural way it raged with the *utmost fury*, and to make his assertion good, says that of something more than 5000, decumbents near 900 died." These figures are in Mather's letter of March 10, 1721-2; but the expression "raged with the utmost fury," as well as the inference about lack of precaution, is not found there. Douglass seems to have taken these from Jurin (see the passages quoted above).

³ See pp. 457-458, *supra*.

VIII. THE CASE OF THE SMALL-POX INOCULATED. 1723.

The American Antiquarian Society possesses Mather's own draught of a rather long communication to the Royal Society dated May 4, 1723, and entitled *The Case of the Small-Pox Inoculated; further Cleared. To D' James Jurin*. The essay was sent to Jurin by Mather along with the well-known letter of May 21, 1723, in which he requested an official judgment on the disputed question of his right to style himself an F. R. S.¹ The essay is sufficiently familiar to students of Mather MSS. My sole excuse, then, for mentioning it here is the fact that I have ascertained, since the present paper was submitted to the Society, the existence of another copy of the document.

Some weeks ago Mr. Tuttle called to my notice the occurrence of an article on inoculation by Cotton Mather in Sir Arthur H. Church's list of papers in the Archives of the Royal Society.² Suspecting that this might be *The Case of the Small-Pox Inoculated further Cleared*, I addressed a letter of inquiry to Mr. Robert Harrison, the Assistant Secretary and Librarian, asking him to send me the opening and the closing words of the Royal Society MS. and to indicate its form and extent. Mr. Harrison replied with a promptness and courtesy which lay me under great obligations to him. The document, he informs me,³ "is written on small 4to paper and extends to 17 pages. It is entitled 'The Case of the Small-pox Inoculated, further cleared,' and is dated May 21st, 1723." This date, we note at once, corresponds with that of the letter in which the manuscript was enclosed, — not with the date (May 4) of the draught. The change was a natural one on Mather's part. The Royal Society MS. begins:

It is a thing well known to all who know anything, that the *Small-pox* has from the days that the *Saracens* brought it into *Europe* with them, still proved a *Great Plague* unto the Inhabitants of the Earth, and bin enough, if there were nothing else, to pro-

¹ See *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts*, XIV. 107-109; cf. p. 418, note 1, *supra*.

² *The Royal Society Archives, 'Classified Papers' of the Period 1606-1741* (Oxford, privately printed, 1907), 28 (noted as preserved in "Guard Books, XXIII. (2) 31").

³ In a letter of March 22, 1912.

cure the Denomination of a *Wo*, for those woful *Harpyes*. The Numbers of the Slain by this tremendous Malady, have been far more than of those, who have perished by the *Pestilence*; and the Distemper which has been, by way of Eminency called, *The Destroyer*, has not been such a *Besome of Destruction* as this Competitor to it, among them, who have had ye *Graves waiting for them*.

It ends as follows:

I write unto a person of so much Goodness, that I am sure he will pardon the Fatigue, which the perusal of this Long Epistle may give him; upon an Affair the Importance whereof will make its Apology; and he will with his usual Candour, accept the Intention of,

Syr,

Your most hearty

Friend & Servant,

COTTON MATHER.

Boston, New England.

"The paper," adds Mr. Harrison, "is not in Mather's own autograph, though signed and dated by him."

This account of the article establishes its complete identity with the communication of which the American Antiquarian Society possesses the holograph draught.

Accession no.

ACK

Author

Kittredge, G.L.

Some lost works of
Cotton Mather.

Call no. 1912.

INOCULATION
VACCINATION

